3 1761 07167917 9

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto

http://www.archive.org/details/puritanismorchur00coit

Eccl US
C.

PURITANISM:

OR,

A CHURCHMAN'S DEFENCE AGAINST ITS ASPERSIONS,

BY

AN APPEAL TO ITS OWN HISTORY.

"Tender stomachs that cannot endure milk, but can very well digest iron."
Jeremy Taylor's Works, vi. cccxxxv.

"Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged."
Bancroft's United States, i. 451.

By THOMAS W. COIT, D.D.,
RECTOR OF TRINITY CHURCH, NEW-ROCHELLE, N. Y., AND A MEMBER OF THE NEW-YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

200042
21/1/26

NEW-YORK:
D. APPLETON & CO., 200 BROADWAY.
PHILADELPHIA:
GEORGE S. APPLETON,
No. 148 Chesnut-st.
MDCCCXLV.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by
THOMAS W. COIT,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New-York.

J. F. Trow & Co., prs., 33 Ann-street.

"They tell us, that on the highest of the Capsian mountains in Spain, there is a lake, whereinto if you throw a stone, there presently ascends a smoke, which forms a dense cloud, from whence issues a tempest of rain, hail, and horrid thunder-claps, for a good quarter of an hour. Our Church History will be like a stone cast into that lake, for the furious tempest which it will raise among some, whose ecclesiastical dignities have set them, as on the top of Spanish mountains."—MATHER'S MAGNALIA, i. 35, edit. 1820.

"Milton was a Puritan."

Leonard Bacon's Hist. Disc. p. 36.

Behold, then, a Puritan's picture of the Westminster Assembly of Divines!—

"Setting sail to all winds, that might blow gain into their covetous bosoms."

"They taught compulsion without conviction, which not long before they complained of as executed unchristianly, against themselves."

"And well did their disciples manifest themselves to be no better principled than their teachers, trusted with committeeships and other gainful offices, upon their commendations for zealous, (and as they sticked not to term them,) godly men; but executing their places like children of the devil, unfaithfully, unjustly, unmercifully, and where not corruptly, stupidly. So that between them the teachers, and these the disciples, there hath not been *a more ignominious and mortal wound to faith, to piety, to the work of reformation, nor more cause of blaspheming given to the enemies of God and truth, since the first preaching of reformation.*"

Milton's Prose Works, in one vol. Lond. 1838, p. 503.

N. B. An intelligent reader will not be surprised to learn, that the Puritans have succeeded in suppressing the above passages, with a number more like them, in most of the editions of Milton. See note to the edition quoted, p. 502.

PREFACE.

In the autumn of 1843, I received, from several of the bishops and a large number of the clergy, a letter relative to certain communications made by me to "The Churchman," during the year 1835, concerning the history of the Puritans, and their harsh and unwearied cavils against Episcopalians. They expressed an earnest desire that those letters should be revised, and published in a permanent form; giving it as their decided opinion, that "the cause of truth and justice" required the labor at my hands. It was not the first nor the twentieth time, probably, that I had been approached upon the subject—a subject which the recollection of abuse, ("rain, hail, and horrid thunder-claps,") poured upon me without measure, determined me never to resume on my individual responsibility. But it was the first time that my brethren in the ministry seemed willing, by giving me their signatures, to share with me the responsibility of publishing disagreeable facts. Accordingly, I felt it to be a duty to go forward to my task, and made some preparation for it without delay. But another work, which the Church was pleased to ask of me, interfered, (the editing of a Standard Prayer Book,) and it was not until this last winter, that I could devote myself to labors, which it was my intention to have begun a year sooner.

Nor was I able to complete those labors, as soon as was expected of me. The original letters of 1835 were less used, than it was presumed they would be, the work swelled under my hand, and has become, a large portion of it, entirely new.

I was the more willing, perhaps, that it should be mainly new, as the temper of it, in its first form, was so much complained of. Probably, many will think it sharp enough now; but they may be assured it is easier, vastly easier, to be sharp than to be otherwise, in reviewing the sharpest and most unflagging of all fault-finders—a full-blooded Puritan. Such an one seems never so much at home, as when he is whetting his knife or dissecting; and to contemplate him disarmed requires serious effort. The candid among my brethren will therefore give me credit for moderation, rather than tax me with severity. As to "those without," I must, of course, expect no quarter, for rousing facts from a sleep, which they fain hoped to make eternal. So I must look to posterity for justice, and bide my time.

It was necessary, probably, that *some one* should bring these facts into open view; and if I am to be victimized for thus doing, be it so. My FACTS will not be extinguished, if I myself am rhetorically crucified.

Non omnis moriar; multaque pars mei
Vitabit Libitinam.

I close all I have to say in this connexion, with a reference to a remark of the late Dr. Dwight of Yale College. In his Letters on New England, to put an end to the complaints of foreigners about persecutions inflicted by Puritans, he says, "An Englishman, certainly, must, if

he look into the ecclesiastical annals of his own country, be forever silent on the subject." (Travels, i. pp. 163, 164.) If this logic is good, then when a Puritan looks into the ecclesiastical annals of *his* predecessors, he must be as silent also. Dr. Dwight has settled this point from his presidential chair, (a throne if it were in England,) and the criminations of Plymouth Rock orators are at an end, "forever."

I have but a word more to offer, and that respects the execution of my work. The nature of the argument (*one* in its aim, but *numerous* in its applications) required me to go over the same ground, again and again. If, then, sentiments or authorities are occasionally repeated, it is hoped an excuse will be found for me, in the necessity of the case—in the importance of helping dull memories by iterations—and in the example of Puritan orators, etc., who have repeated the same things, systematically, for some two hundred years.

New Rochelle, N. Y.,
July 9, 1845.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LETTER I., p. 13.

General sketch of the subjects embraced in these Letters. The motives which prompted them, and the plan pursued.

LETTER II., p. 25.

Origin and aim of Puritanism in England.

LETTER III., p. 40.

The temper of Puritanism in England, with its treatment there.

LETTER IV., p. 63.

Expatriation of the Puritans. Was "a purely religious cause" its object?

LETTER V., p. 79.

Review of some apologies for the Puritans, offered by their advocates.

LETTER VI., p. 104.

Review of the reasons for Puritan expatriation, assigned in N. Morton's "New England's Memorial."

LETTER VII., p. 130.

Early history of Puritanism in New England. The patents from the Virginia and Plymouth companies, Massachusetts charters, etc.

LETTER VIII., p. 153.

Professions of the Puritans towards the Church of England. Their rejection of the ordinations of that Church. Reordinations of Episcopal clergymen. Lay ordinations, etc.

LETTER IX., p. 174.

Treatment of early Episcopal settlers by the Puritans. William Blackstone—the Browns—Bright—Morell—Vassall—petitioners of 1646.

LETTER X., p. 194.

New England in the days of the Commonwealth. Importance of dates to illustrate Laud's conduct. Cromwell tries to check New England. Treatment of Churchmen by the Puritans, from the days of Charles II. and onward.

LETTER XI., p. 214.

Puritan church Establishment. Fines, etc., under this Establishment. Laws against Holy-Days. Contempt of Puritan ministers punished. Richard Gibson. Gov. Andross in a Puritan meeting-house. Puritanism less republican than is supposed.

LETTER XII., p. 238.

Influence of the Puritan ministers in both Church and State. Administrations of Gov. Winthrop and Gov. Endicott.

LETTER XIII., p. 260.

Puritanic efforts to defeat an American Episcopate, and to thwart Episcopal missionaries. Episcopacy invidiously represented as a cause of the American Revolution.

LETTER XIV., p. 279.

Puritanic treatment of the Baptists.

LETTER XV., p. 306.

Puritanic treatment of the Quakers.

LETTER XVI., p. 333.

Puritanic treatment of the Papists.

LETTER XVII., p. 361.

Puritanic treatment of the Presbyterians.

LETTER XVIII., p. 394.

Puritanic treatment of the Indians.

LETTER I.

TO THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY, WHO HAVE URGED ME TO MY PRESENT UNDERTAKING.

FATHERS AND BRETHREN :—

Agreeably to the plan which I have marked out for myself, this first letter will be, almost entirely, an exact reprint of the first letter on the Puritans, addressed to "The Churchman" in January 1835. I consider it important to give this letter in full, as well because it is a bird's-eye view of the whole subject, as because it shows the provocation under which I at first acted. That letter was designed to be all I might write; but a fresh and bitterer provocation induced me to continue writing. I accordingly commenced anew, but with abundant references to books and documents, to show that I did not mean to deal in unsupported allegations; and I was not aware that I was under the influence of an angry temper; for I am quite sure, Puritan history has made me smile twenty times, where it has made me scowl once: if, indeed, I am amenable to the charge of scowling, in any just degree whatever. Nevertheless, I was informed, to my profound astonishment, that I was considered quite ferocious; and, at Andover, pronounced to be (after the fashion of old indictments,) under the direct instigation of the devil. And when so told I smiled again; for, un-

conscious of any malice, I thought the sting of my papers lay in my facts; and especially in my arranging those facts under a line of poetry, taken from *a Puritan himself*, and which he would fain have applied to Churchmen, or to dissenters from a Puritan establishment. The line—"Old wounds need vinegar as well as oil"—is doubtless well remembered; but perhaps it is not as well remembered, that when I was informed of its offensiveness, I struck it out, and never intruded it again.

But I will not dwell on these matters, and postpone what is far more important. They have been introduced solely to show, that when I wrote before, I was not under the influence of that aggressive hostility to Puritanism, which many imputed to me, and that I am not under it still. I wrote, because constrained to do it in defence of our Church; and take up my pen again, not self-prompted, but at your urgent request, because you assure me the Church may be benefited by my humble advocacy. I regret the necessity which requires us, in support of our own cause, to tell plain and unwelcome truths concerning our opponents; but, relying on your judgment in the case, shall proceed to my task. One thing those opponents most certainly must admit, viz: that I have been in no hurry to repeat the disagreeable statements I once made; or to repeat them in a more durable form than that of a fugitive newspaper. It is now more than ten years, since I first wrote what here follows.

I have just been reading a pamphlet, the imitator of a *succession* as closely adhered to by Congregationalists, as the apostolical one by Churchmen. Its title is, "Great Principles associated with Plymouth Rock." Now, Mr Editor, suppose your humble servant were to attempt a pamphlet with a similar title, only altering the association from this much-famed piece of granite, to some spot of clay, or sand,

in Virginia, or Maryland, or Pennsylvania, or perchance to quite as good a block of stone on the shores of Rhode Island[1]—how our Massachusetts Puritans,[2] (I beg pardon, the descendants of them—the name is rather unsavory to some,) would stare! And yet as a Churchman, or a Roman Catholic, or a Quaker, or a Baptist, it might be done by me with a very serene conscience, as these few lines may show.

The celebrity of Plymouth-rock heroes is expatiated on, year by year, with most unflagging perseverance. Why? Oh! because, as this address tells us, for about the two-hundreth time, (they landed in 1620,) "they were persecuted—that they fled from persecution—that they came in suffering and poverty to a desolate shore, in the dreariness of winter, and reared their rude habitations amid 'the peltings of the pitiless storm,' and the ravages of disease;" (p. 19;) because they were striving "to escape from the tyranny of unjust kings, and the domination of lords spiritual;" (p. 12;) and were willing to endure all this, that they might throw off "the yoke of despotism, and cast aside the mummeries of superstition;" (p. 12;) because, "if a heathen could declare, that a great man struggling with adversity is a sight worthy of the gods," then we ought to "venerate Christians, thus suffering with fortitude for conscience' sake." (p. 19.)

Is the tyranny by which public opinion is swayed—the yoke under which it is bowed—the mummery by which it is mocked, never to cease?

Here are a body of men who desert their native land,[3] at a most inclement season of the year, and subject themselves to excessive and protracted hardships. True, the spectacle is melancholy, and we are fain to pity it. But so also is the spectacle of the privations endured by a Greenland

[1] See Note 1. [2] See Note 2. [3] See Note 3.

whale-fisherman: why are we not as much bound to compassionate him? This question shows, it is not their mere losses and pains, which makes the case of the Puritans deeply lamentable. Still, as the naked exhibition of human misery (aside from its causes) is an effective means by which to move our sensibilities, it has been unfailingly relied on by Plymouth orators. So the advocates in Roman courts often introduced the wives and children of an individual client, and made their tears and moans speak for him. At this day, whether rhetoric is argument need not be asked. Let us then forego sensibility a moment, and with cool justice inquire, simply and plainly, *why* the Puritans came to these Atlantic shores. Did they abandon England *solely*, or even *principally*, on account of religious considerations?[4] My answer is an immediate negative: and I think it can easily be made out from a single work I have at hand, and might as well or better be from many others, had I at this moment access to them. The work alluded to is entitled, "An Account of the European Settlements in America, in six parts." London, 1757. 2 vols. 8vo. The work is a rare and valuble one, and speaks with candor of the faults and excellencies of both parties.

It states unequivocally, (vol. ii. 137, 138,) that "early in the reign of King James, a number of persons of this persuasion [Puritan] had sought refuge in Holland; in which, though a country of the greatest religious freedom in the world, they did not find themselves better satisfied than they had been in England. They were tolerated, indeed, but watched; their zeal began to have dangerous languors for want of opposition, and being without power or consequence, they grew tired of the indolent security of their sanctuary; they chose to remove to a place where they should see no superior." Now, if they merely wanted freedom of con-

[4] See Note 4.

science, they had it in Holland, *ex abundanti.* But as our author affirms, with unquestionable truth, they were there "without power or consequence." And, moreover, as their charter for a settlement in America, which they had wit or influence enough to obtain *even when they had left England*[5] —as this charter shows, they were not quite so stern in practice, as in preaching, about the compatibility between piety and a regard to temporal interests. These formidable denouncers of that love which is "the root of all evil," took precious good care that this charter should cover an "exclusive trade," "from Nova Scotia to the southern parts of Carolina," and, (though they had a most pious horror of the Pope, and would have execrated him from head to foot, after his own fashion of cursing, for giving away the soil of South America,) that it should also guarantee "the entire property of the soil besides." (See vol. ii. 138, of the work above.) Nay, as this same work shows, p. 140, "the then profitable trade of furs and skins," and the fisheries, induced not a few, "uneasy at home upon a *religious* account," to go where they might enjoy the invaluable privilege of free thought, and the inconsiderable one of making money a little faster.

In connexion with the testimony of the work just quoted, I cannot refrain from adding one which occurs to me, from a discourse I heard delivered a few years since, before the Essex Historical Society, by the Hon. Justice Story.* It amply proves, that aversion to the Church of England, as a *spiritual institution*, was by no means the excuse of the Puritans for expatriating themselves from a land dear to them by almost every sacred tie. The Judge quoted from their farewell communication, when they were under weigh, or had just launched upon the deep. He showed how they called the Church of England their "dear mother," and

[5] See Note 5.

* Delivered Sept. 18, 1828; and now to be found in Story's Miscellanies, p. 34.

indulged in terms of unbounded reverence and affection towards her. In fact, so strong and pertinent was the language quoted by him,* that, as it fell from his lips, a Calvinist near me was unable to keep quiet. True to his sect, he could not accredit the Judge's honesty, in a matter which militated against them; for he knew that the sympathies of the speaker were with Unitarians. So, turning to me, he whispered with most ominous emphasis and deliberation, "*Can this be true?*"

Such evidence, Mr. Editor, (and it might be piled up in heaps, if necessary,) establishes incontestably the fact, that persecution for religious opinions never *drove* the Puritans from home, to seek the inhospitable shelter of a howling wilderness. They might have had comfortable homes, by good Dutch peat-fires, and lived and died unmolested and unfearing; although, perhaps, with less stock at the banker's, than "exclusive trade" in furs and fisheries might secure. But they wanted a little more notoriety—a little more power—a little more money. They who wielded the government of England, and enjoyed its offices, were Episcopalians: those who were at the helm in Holland, were Presbyterians; who were rather more fond than they of Arminianism,† and fully as much so of "exclusive trade," and "entire property" in soil. The ascendency in Holland would be as hard to gain, as the ascendency at home; (I mean the ascendency in politics, money-making and religion;) and so nothing remained but to "hoist the mainsail to the wind," and steer for a land where they might be unrivalled and supreme.

Verily this is the plain case, and the whole of it. The Puritans did not hate the Church of England *per se.*[6] Their affectionate and reverential language, (language

[6] See Note 6.

* Story's Miscellanies, p. 54.

† I should have said 'of their own church polity.'

strong enough to excite suspicions of garbling and misquotation, against a gentleman of unblemished honor and integrity,) proves this beyond all question; or they really were, what their enemies have called them, canting hypocrites. If they could have enjoyed the powers, immunities, and revenues of the Church of England, that Church would have become "all glorious within:" she would have been "without wrinkle and without spot;" as she would now be, in the eyes of many a Dissenter, who is sounding alarms about her corruptions, and shouting 'Reform! Reform!' with the vociferous zeal of the multitude, who cried 'Crucify him! Crucify him!'[7] They were any thing but inimical to Establishments *on principle;* for they commenced their own Establishment in Massachusetts, with marvellous speed and sagacity; and so well were its foundations laid—so accurately and solidly were its parts cemented, that we find the author of our address saying, (p. 26,) "The last link, connecting Church and State in this Commonwealth, has happily been broken, by abolishing the law requiring a general assessment for the support of public worship:"—broken however, be it remembered, not till 1834:—pretty good iron, Mr. Editor, and well taken care of, to last so long.[8]

I say they commenced their own Establishment. Let our author speak to this point. (Eu. Sett. ii. 144.) "As soon as they began to think of making laws, I find no less than five about matters of religion; all contrived, and not only contrived but executed in some respects with so much rigor, that the persecution which drove the Puritans out of England, [you see he spares not Churchmen,] might be considered as great lenity and indulgence in the comparison."[9]

The penalties of these laws were inflicted on Episcopa-

[7] See Note 7. [8] See Note 8. [9] See Note 9.

lians, Roman Catholics, Quakers, and Baptists; who were arraigned, fined, proscribed, banished, threatened with death, and in several instances *actually executed.* Yes, be it never forgotten, when an attempt is made to drug us with the praises of meek and mourning Puritans—martyrs in the cause of truth and conscience—that, though lambs dumb before their shearers in England, a journey of three thousand miles was enough to convert them into wolves that dabble in blood![10] Such men, (the black deed cannot be wiped out of history's page,) appealed to the cord and the gibbet, when decrees of banishment and threats of violence were not sufficiently intimidating. The fires of Smithfield —the dungeons of the Inquisition—the fines of the Star Chamber, are all bad enough; but let a Puritan beware of comment on them; his own story, especially when contrasted with his pretensions, is as bad as any chapter in the horrible or disgusting records of human wrath and violence.[11] Indeed, I never wonder, as I read it, at the keen and witty comment of one of their own number, whom detestation of their uncharitableness constrained to seek refuge in the very country he had abandoned.* "I fled," said he, "from England to escape the tyranny of *my lord-bishops;* but I was glad to get back again to escape the tyranny of *my lord-brethren.*"[12] †

Let us now turn, a few moments, from the Puritans to their neighbors; pretendedly so much their inferiors in piety, and confessedly their inferiors in the love of power and domination, and withal of finding and keeping money.

The poor CAVALIERS, and their descendants, fled from

[10] See Note 10. [11] See Note 11. [12] See Note 12.

* So I then thought; but it seems he went to Rhode Island.

† This was said by the Rev. Mr. Blackstone, whom Cotton Mather condescends to call one of the "some godly Episcopalians." Magnalia, i. 221.

Puritan persecution, in the days of the Parliament, and sought refuge in Virginia. There they were content to remain in quiet, if undisturbed. But no: the trade in tobacco, &c., was getting to be valuable; and missionaries were therefore necessary to convert them to the true faith! Missionaries were actually sent from New England to Virginia, and by men whose descendants raised a grievous outcry, in the days of Drs. Mayhew and Apthorp, because the Society for Propagating the Gospel presumed to send missionaries to Massachusetts—a soil, forsooth, "the entire property," (remember the charter, Mr. Editor,) "the entire property" of the Puritans. It were a singular theme of speculation, to pause here and try to conjecture why, when a Papist or a Churchman descants on *ecclesiastical jurisdiction*, his ideas are divertingly ridiculous, but wholly change their nature when the theme of a Congregationalist. But this curious subject must be left, with some other mysteries in our American logic and psychology, to an author of our own Church; who, when his history of Virginia, &c., shall appear, will undoubtedly solve them for the satisfaction of all, at least, of all Churchmen.[13]

I proceed. In Maryland the Roman Catholics clustered together; but they, although quite as much, or more oppressed by civil enactments than the Puritans, better estimated the value of an unharassed conscience, and more cordially respected its privileges. In Maryland, (so the Roman Catholics claim: see the well-written pastoral letter of their prelates, assembled in council in Baltimore, a few years since,) the rights of conscience were *first* fully recognized in this country. This is a fact I never knew disputed by good authority; and, though a Protestant with all my heart, I accord them the full praise of it with the frankest sincerity, and boldly declare, it honors them on the

[13] See Note 13.

silent page of our annals, more than the Puritans were ever honored by the noisy plaudits of a hundred Plymouth declaimers.[14]

In Pennsylvania, the scouted QUAKERS acknowledged, respected, and granted the right of unrestricted enjoyment in matters of religion.

In Rhode Island, the same thing was done by Roger Williams, and the *banished Baptists.*

Now, Mr. Editor, in view of so cursory an illustration and comparison as even this, let me ask,—Is it fair, is it honorable, is it candid, for a selfish and unsparing clan, who with their descendants never admitted nor conceded the right of private judgment—who linked Church and State together so tightly, that centuries could hardly sunder them—who persecuted by law, by penalties, by proscription and violence—who shrunk not from the tremendous daring of deeds of blood in the sight of all heaven—is it fair, is it honorable, is it candid, oh! is it to be tolerated, that such men should be eulogized, and re-eulogized, with every successive year, until their fame has become a standing topic for canonization? To me, when I think of the superior liberality of Churchmen, of Papists, of Quakers, and of Baptists, this seems at times quite monstrous; and I feel as if a few of the unlovely, nay the disgraceful, merciless, and sanguinary passages of Puritan history, in this country, ought to be known and well known. They shall be, if the writer live to see the repetition of laudatory harangues over them. He has borne the infliction of such harangues, till he thought the good sense of the community would be an ample correction. It seems that this cannot be relied on, for the simple reason, that but few of the community have ever heard but one side of the question; and on that so many changes have been rung, as to induce many to believe none other

[14] See Note 14.

can be sounded. Our patience is not respected. Still the wearisome and revolting tale about the persecutions of the Church of England is clanged, clanged in our ears, and thrust up in our faces; as though it would be heresy or treason to think it suspicious or untrue. Such treatment can only be parried by alert self-defence. Let this then be resorted to. It has been attempted in this hasty sketch; which, scanty as it is, can still show what *might* be said, and may possibly provoke a caution, which has long been swallowing anodynes and has fallen asleep.

January 24, 1835.

Such was the beginning of my observations on the Puritans, at the date given above; and, with this, it was fully intended my labors, in the defence of our Church against modern assailants, should rest. But, (if I may repeat a little, to be very explicitly understood,) my ink was scarcely dry, when my resolution was put to an acute trial by another pamphlet, far more virulent than its predecessor; which I described, at the time, in language of little reserve, but which, as some thought it too caustic, shall not be reiterated. Feeling challenged to meet the issue I had contemplated, but earnestly hoped to escape, I commenced again, and wrote for "The Churchman" (published then, as it still is, in New-York,) a series of articles, which drew down upon my name a shower of scorching execrations, that might well have withered a stronger resolution than I ever could boast of. But, luckily for myself, I was in retirement, and knew extremely little of what was said by friend or foe. I heard of the storm after it had passed, and with amazement; for I did not imagine that, in this enlightened and liberal age, *facts* (and my columns were studded with references) could alarm any one. Yet so it was; and so thoroughly was I possessed with the idea that I had acquired a most unblessed

celebrity, that, though urged and urged again to put my articles into a permanent form, I steadily refused. Churchmen have so often assured me that I have erred, and such a list of names is at last sent to induce me to yield my determination, that I have acquiesced. And I have done so with a firm belief, that the virulence of past days has not abated. Never have American Episcopalians known more fiery trials, under the assaults of adversaries, than during the last few years. And these assaults threaten, like Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, to be seven times hotter. For example, could any thing, in the compass of the human imagination, picture our Church in a more woeful, reprobate condition, than the last New Englander, (Oct. 1844, p. 526,) which portrays it as on the eve of becoming "a sacramental way to hell?"* If in such circumstances, then, some of that plainness of speech and open array of fact, which was deemed so unnecessary in 1835, be again attempted, upon the heads of those who have provoked it let the blame fall.

My plan, in the letters that may follow, will be to give a brief outline of the origin and aim of Puritanism in England, with some developments of its temper and treatment; then to pursue its history in New England, more in detail, as was before done. For the accomplishment of my work, I shall rely much upon the letters addressed to "The Churchman;" though I shall not quote them as I have the first, and shall endeavor to have less "vinegar" in my ink, than I was supposed to use previously, however the sharpness of the times might justify its employment.

* This is an echo, like many such things, of the style of an earlier day. Bogue and Bennett represent the Puritans as flying from a false and superstitious religion with impositions on conscience—the greatest evil on this side hell.—Hist. of Dissenters, ii. 427. One of the fashionable Puritan ways, in old times, to describe the Church of England, was to say, that she was "Anti-Christian, yea, of the Devil."—Edwards' Gangraena, pt. i. p. 25. Or see Edwards quoted in Note 29.

LETTER II.

Pursuing my plan, I shall endeavor, in this letter, to present you my views of the origin and rise of Puritanism in England.

It is generally supposed that Puritanism took its rise from the exiles, who were compelled to fly the kingdom in the reign of Queen Mary, and who sojourned on the continent long enough to imbibe a love for the discipline and doctrine of the continental Protestants. But a writer, who deals largely in quotations from their own books, and who lived through all the reverses of Charles I. and Abp. Laud, maintains the contrary. This writer is Sir William Dugdale, who was born in 1605 and died in 1686. In his folio upon "the late troubles in England," published in 1681, he advances the opinion, that they were first imported into England from the continent, in the reign of King Edward VI., and created so much disturbance as to excite the ire even of Calvin, who was no enemy of wholesome authority, and by no means shrank from the use of carnal weapons and material fire. Calvin would have had Somerset, the Protector during Edward's minority, restrain them "by the revenging sword."*

No doubt the leaven of Puritanism was working in England before the days of Queen Elizabeth. The very emblem of it (a round head) was well known in Germany, long before its appearance on English shores;† and if the *outside*

* Dugdale, p. 9.

† Dugdale, p. 8.

of its head was imported from a land of fierce fanaticism, it is hard to suppose that some of the *inside* of it did not come from the same source. Bishop Hall fearlessly avowed as much, in his place in Parliament. "Your Lordships know," said he in one of his speeches, "that the Jack Straws, and Cades, and Wat Tylers of former times, did not more cry down learning than nobility; and those of your Lordships that have read the history of the Anabaptistical tumults at Munster, will need no other item: let it be enough to say, that many of these sectaries are of the same profession."* The fanatics of Germany then are the first fathers of Puritanism—fanatics, whom the sternness of Roman despotism drove into the terrible extremes which they adventured. There is no question, however, that Puritanism was abetted and fomented by the exiles who returned from Geneva and elsewhere, saturated with foreign discipline, doctrine, and politics; and as these exiles were made such, by the same despotism, we are in more than one way indebted to the Romish Church for all the evils which Puritanism has drawn in its train.[15] Rome denounces the Protestant world for its dissensions. When *all* liberty has been taken from men, they are apt to abuse it, if regained by blood from their oppressors; and more of the sin of Protestant dissension will be found in the skirts of Popery, than was ever remotely suspected in the halls of the Vatican.†

And in England itself, the commencement of Puritanism was neither unnoticed nor unregarded by politicians,

[15] See Note 15.

* Works, viii. 490.

† Singularly enough, as some may think, this very opinion was entertained by Abp. Laud himself. In his most able Conference with the Jesuit Fisher, he affirmed, that the divisions of Protestants were the inevitable result of "the corruptions and superstitions of Rome, which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary."—(Conference, Oxford edit. 1839, p. 112.)

and by politicians of high station. It is well known that many politicians, in the reign of Henry VIII., favored his Protestant views; not so much because they loved the Romish Church but little, as because they loved its spoils the more. Greedy politicians battened upon the impropriated revenues of the Church then, and they hoped to play the same game over again, in the days of Elizabeth. Bishops were lords under a Protestant queen, as well as under a Popish monarch; and in the progress of time their sees were calculated to become richer than ever, by a natural advance in the value of landed property. This was easily foreseen, by eyes roving for golden prospects; and any scheme which would divert the lands of an Episcopal see, and erect them into a temporal barony, was of course a fair one to find favor. Good Isaac Walton saw through all this, with half an eye, and thus states the matter in his life of Richard Hooker. "So that those very men, that began with tender, meek petitions, proceeded to admonitions, then to satirical remonstrances; and at last having, like Absalom, numbered who was not and who was for their cause, they got a supposed certainty of so great a party, that they durst threaten first the bishops, and then the Queen and Parliament: to all which they were secretly encouraged by the Earl of Leicester, then in great favor with her Majesty, and the reputed cherisher and patron-general of these pretenders to tenderness of conscience: his design being, by their means, to bring such odium upon the bishops, as to procure the alienation of their lands, and a large proportion of them for himself; which avaricious desire had at last so blinded his reason, that his ambitious and greedy hopes seemed to put him into a present possession of Lambeth House."*

* Hanbury's Hooker, i. pp. lxxv, lxxvi. Maddox's Vindication, pp. 186, 187. Soame's Elizabethan History, 78, 366–67. Broughton's Dict. ii. 303. Lathbury's Eng. Episcopacy, 43. King Charles saw the same disposition in his day. "The confiscation of men's estates being

And there is stronger testimony than this, which goes straight to show, that the Puritans looked further, much further, than relief from a few "indifferent ceremonies." "The same spirit," says De Lolme, "which had made an attack on the established faith, now directed itself to politics."* This was in reference to a somewhat later time than the period now under review; but it is the direct fulfilment of a prophecy uttered by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, in an official letter, so early as A. D. 1573. "In the platform set down by these new builders, we evidently see the spoliation of the patrimony of Christ and a popular state to be sought. The end will be, ruin to religion, and confusion to our country."† Laud, who by a singular coincidence was born this very year, 1573, foresaw and predicted the same result. "These men," said he, "do but begin with the Church, that they might after have the freer access to the State."[16]‡ For Laud was a scholar, beyond even Puritan question; and I dare say he remembered his Virgil, or Montaigne's beautiful version of him, where he says: "I am betimes sensible of the little breezes, that begin to sing and whistle in the shrouds; the forerunners of the storm." The protestation of loyalty, required of Puritans as well as Papists, demonstrates the open apprehension of Elizabeth's government; though Mr. Neal, with his usual confidence, presumes to say there was "no manner of occasion" for it.§

And, beginning upon the Church, where did their advancing and branching schemes design to end? In nothing less than in a political, as well as ecclesiastical, revolution

[16] See Note 16.

---

more beneficial than the charity of saving their lives, or reforming their errors."—Eikon Basilike, p. 105. London, 1824.

* De Lolme on the Constitution, p. 50.

† Collier's Eccl. Hist. vi. 536.

‡ Harris's Charles I. p. 231.

§ Neal's Puritans, i. 274.

of all England. "Reformation *begins* at the sanctuary," was their motto, in the preface to a most radical little volume, called the "Anatomy of the Service Booke;" which was intended to provoke Parliament to throw the Liturgy overboard, that bishops, and king, and constitution, might follow after. Truly, they would have "meted out and trodden down" Church and State, "as straw is trodden down for the dunghill;" and built every thing anew, after "the right stamp, and agreeable to the pattern in the Mount."*

This is admitted, virtually, by Mr. Hallam, who calls Laud "choleric, vindictive," &c., and grants, as a sweet concession, that he was "not literally destitute of religion." He allows that their writings prove, that they would have made no compromise, short of the overthrow of the Established Church.† It is admitted by Peirce, in his Vindication of Dissenters, in terms still stronger. "But I fear," he says, "could they have obtained their desire of the Parliament, the *platform* they proposed must have been established by some persecuting laws."‡ That is, they not only wanted their own establishment, but wanted it, besides, a persecuting one. Brook, another of their zealous advocates, makes a similar admission.§ Their principles, as disclosed in the quotations of Dugdale, and Bp. Hall, (see vol. x. of his Works,) show their wishes in formidable fulness. But, better perhaps than any thing, their terrible sort of conspirator's oath, proves how deeply their revolutionary spirit had penetrated; and how much they hoped to effect, by using the souls as well as bodies of sworn associates. Well does Collier say, "as none were more active to increase their party, so they were particularly careful to fasten their proselytes, and to fix them in their mistakes." He says this in prefacing the

* Camb. and Saybrook Platforms, p. 6, ed. 1829.

† Quarterly Review, 37, pp. 225, 226, 239.

‡ Vind. p. 84.

§ Christian Observer, American Edition, xiv, 397.

oath, which, though long, is given in full, as an original document of the highest authority.*

"Being thoroughly persuaded in my conscience, by the working and by the word of the Almighty, that these relics of ANTICHRIST be abominable before the Lord our God; and also for that by the power, mercy, strength, and goodness of the Lord our God only, I am escaped from the filthiness and pollution of these detestable traditions, through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and, last of all, inasmuch as by the working also of the Lord Jesus his Holy Spirit, I have joined in prayer and hearing God's word, with those that have not yielded to this idolatrous trash, notwithstanding the danger for not coming to my parish church, &c. Therefore I come not back again to the preaching, &c., of them that have received those marks of the Romish beast.

"I. Because of God's commandment to go forward to perfection. Heb. vi. 1; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Psalm lxxxiv. 1; Eph. iv. 15. Also to avoid them, Rom. xvi. 17; Eph. v. 11; 1 Thess. v. 22.

"II. Because they are abomination before the Lord our God, Deut. vii. 25, 26, and xiii. 17; Ezek. xiv. 6.

"III. I will not beautify with my presence those filthy rags, which bring the heavenly word of the Eternal, our Lord God, into bondage, subjection, and slavery.

"IV. Because I would not communicate with other men's sins; John ii. 9, 10, 11; 2 Cor. vi. 17. Touch no unclean thing, &c., Sirach xiii. 1.[17]

"V. They give offences both to the preachers and the hearers. Rom. xvi. 17; Luke xvii. 1.

"VI. They gladden and strengthen the Papists in their errors, and grieve the godly; Ezek. xiii. 21, 22. Note this 21st verse.

[17] See Note 17.

* Collier's Eccl. Hist. vi. 538, 539; or ii. 544.

"VII. They do persecute our Saviour Jesus Christ in his members; Acts ix. 4, 5; 2 Cor. i. 5. Also they reject and despise our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; Luke x. 16. Moreover those laborers, who, at the prayer of the faithful, the Lord hath sent forth into his harvest, they refuse, and also reject; Matt. ix. 38.

"VIII. These popish garments are now become very idols indeed, because they are exalted above the word of the Almighty.

"IX. I come not to them, because they should be ashamed, and so leave their idolatrous garments, &c.; 2 Thess. iii. 14. If any man obey not our sayings, note him.

"Moreover, I have now joined myself to the Church of Christ,[18] wherein I have yielded myself subject to the discipline of God's word, as I promised at my baptism;* which, if I should now again mistake, and join myself with their traditions, I should forsake the union wherein I am knit to the body of Christ, and join myself to the discipline of ANTICHRIST. For, in the Church of the traditioners, there is no other discipline than that which hath been maintained by the antichristian pope of Rome: whereby the Church of God has always been afflicted, and is until this day. For the which cause I refuse them.

"God give us grace still to thrive, in suffering under the cross, that the blessed word of our God may only rule, and have the highest place, to cast down strong holds, to destroy or overthrow policy or imaginations, [i. e. polity, or civil government; and imaginations, or systems of religion,] and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and to bring into captivity, or subjection, every

[18] See Note 18.

* Note this. Even in a horrid oath for the destruction of Episcopacy, the Puritans could not forget their Episcopal education. They did not believe, it appears, as their successors do, that baptism is "a mere form."

thought to the obedience of Christ, &c. 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. That the name and word of the Eternal, our Lord God, may be exalted or magnified above all things. Psalm viii. 2."

To this hydra-oath, with these nine awful heads, the following paragraph was annexed, and, says Collier, "stands written in Abp. Parker's hands."

"To this protestation the congregation singularly did swear; and after took the Communion for ratification of their assent."

All this, be it remembered, dates as early as 1573.* No wonder that such an egg hatched all the mischiefs of the rebellion, ending with the downfall, and sack, and devastation, of the Church and State of England.

But if the wrathful and final aim of this tremendous adjuration were so thorough, why, say some, did the Puritans commence their warfare on such jots and tittles as caps and surplices? The answer is easy. How does an expert general attack a fortress, almost impregnable? By drawing his lines of circumvallation, cutting off a bastion here, and a redoubt there; till he can bring his guns to bear upon its citadel, and beat that to pieces about the ears of his opponents, unless they surrender at discretion. And so did the Puritans begin in England. The Church might be made vulnerable, by raising against her the hue and cry of Popery.[19] The State could be made vulnerable through the Church, for both were allied.[20] And thus both might

[19] See Note 19. [20] See Note 20.

* They loved anti-Episcopal oaths so well, they had them in rhyme also. I subjoin a specimen:

"I owe assistance to the king by oath;
And if he please to put the prelates down,
As who can tell what may be, I'll be loath
To see Tom Becket's mitre push the crown."

For this amiable effusion see Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. iv. 104.

be made to fall, and the Puritan darling, Independency, establish its "beautifying presence"* upon their crumbling fragments. "As the hangings are made fit for the house," said the sapper and miner Cartwright, "so the Commonwealth must be made to agree with the Church, and the government thereof with her government."†

"Syllables govern the world," said old Selden, who in many things agreed with the Puritans; though as a philosopher he laughed at their eccentricities. If they could teach the people syllables, they could teach them a creed; and if a creed in religion, why they could teach them a creed in politics too. Charles I. comprehended this game well enough, as his pregnant line, written in Carisbrooke castle, expressively proves. "The crown is crucified with the creed."‡ His nobility comprehended it as fully, as the Earl of Dorset's speech on Prynne's libellous book, proves also. "Though you seemed, by the title of your book, to scourge stage-plays, yet it was to make the people believe that there was an apostacy in the magistrates."§ And even King James saw it, when that sentence dropped from him at Hampton Court, which has so often been referred to, as an evidence of the easy grace with which he inhaled Episcopal flattery. "No bishop," said he, "no king." And thus, exclaim Puritan commentators, the wily prelates caught him with their sycophantic guile. Not so. King Jamie had all the shrewdness of a Scotchman, if he did sometimes exhibit the fooleries of a pedant.[21] His rapid conversion to Episcopacy never surprised me. He divined the *end* of such concessions as were demanded of him; and saw that he would have no peace from one rapacious claim after another, till he laid at the feet of his

[21] See Note 21.

* Vide Puritan Oath, No. iii.

† Maddox Vind. pp. 211, 212.

‡ Harris's Charles I. p. 126.

§ Rushworth's Col. ii. 239.

dictatorial suppliants his royal crown.* And this same divination of the end, too, made him, I doubt not, talk more grandiloquently of the prerogatives of crowned heads, than his secret good sense justified. Fear naturally inclines us to buttress that portion of an edifice we believe most liable to be assaulted. So he bolstered up royalty, with all his might, as did also his successor; and in their just fears, I can find an extenuation for much of the intolerance, for which they have been so coarsely upbraided.

And the end which the Puritans did finally lay hold on, and the manner in which they rode down Episcopalians, and rode round Presbyterians to reach it, satisfies me completely, that that end was foreseen, (in hope at least,) long before they attained the prize of their calling. Nations are not born in a day. The Puritans expected to struggle long, patiently, and in Macedonian phalanx, as their stringent oath demonstrates.† They knew, moreover, that their final object might cost more than their own unassisted efforts could accomplish. It did. They were obliged to court the alliance of sectaries of every name, and, finally, of the Presbyterians of Scotland. The united parties triumphed. "It was the union of the three kinds of Puritans, above mentioned, which gave the Parliament the victory in the civil war which followed."‡ And, then, when the Presbyterians, imagining themselves the stronger portion of the "Holy Alliance," supposed that they would be chiefly benefited, and that their polity would be ascendant in church and state, lo! they found them-

* Compare his own speech.—Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 189. It is fuller, and even pathetic, in the Phenix, i. 169, 170. No one should speak harshly of him, who could speak so tenderly and beautifully of a mother.

† "They proceeded with caution: they never submitted any proposition to the House, calculated to disclose their real sentiments," &c.—Lathbury, 112.

‡ Encyc. Americana, x. 431.

selves foiled by the arts of that serpent, which "was more subtle than any beast of the field." Their disappointment amounted to agony, and vented itself in dolorous groans; as the Gangraena, (oh, Puritanism, what a cankering name!) the Gangraena of Thomas Edwards manifests—an echo of which, in some of its purulent statements, has not yet died away: witness Hetherington's History of the Westminster Assembly. Take this sample, from a multitude, of the character of the "Dissenting Brethren," as he, high-church-wise, cognominates them. "The answer of the Assembly is expressed in somewhat sharper terms, than any of their preceding papers; which is not surprising, considering the disingenuous and evasive conduct of the Independent party, and it certainly exposes their duplicity in a manner altogether unanswerable."[22] *

A word upon the thoroughness with which the Puritans did their work. They were root and branch men, whose favorite text was, "not a hoof shall be left behind." They were the radicals and destructives of their day.[23] † It was not enough for them to annihilate offices, they must cut off heads also. The blood of Strafford, and Laud, and Charles I., will stain their annals forever. They may try to cast its guilt from themselves, and sprinkle it upon the politicians. But politicians might repay the compliment with interest; for probably politicians would never have dreamed of succeeding against the State, if Puritan ecclesiastics had not begun upon the Church; and if they did use them for their own

[22] See Note 22. [23] See Note 23.

---

* Hetherington's Hist. p. 193.

† The wits of the day thus described them:

"Pluto, beware, to thee they come,
When here their work is done:
For they'll break loose, and beat up drum,
And storm thee in thy throne."

Phœnix Britannicus, i. 186.

ends, they after a while were nothing loath, and worked marvellously free in their harness.[24] It will never answer, therefore, for the Puritan ministers to resist the imputation of bloodguiltiness. It is one, and but one, of their unfortunate imitations of Rome; which says she never takes away life, she only excommunicates heretics. True, but those whom she condemns as heretics, the State forthwith condemns (when it dare) to the stake; and if we must burn in an *Auto da Fe*, it matters little who kindles the fagots. The Puritan ministers preached down Strafford, and Laud, and Charles; and Puritan emissaries of state dragged them to the block.

And so it was, afterwards, as we shall by and by see, in New England. *Cœlum non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt.* "They quickly began to do those things themselves, for which they had accused others," says plaintive Robert Barclay.* The Puritan Vatican at Boston issued bulls against Barclay's brethren, and a Puritan governor imbrued his hands in their blood. And, what seems most remarkable, it was a monarch, and a monarch descended from one whose life Puritan violence had shortened, who arrested *their* violence in this far off land. Charles II. interfered, and the gallows saw no more quivering Quakers. The same king it was, too, (laughed at, sneered at, and denounced as he has been a thousand times, by Puritans,) who put an end to what they never thought it necessary to blot from the statute-book, the infernal law *de heretico comburendo.* Who would believe, that such a law's flaming terrors could have been forgotten by the advocates, in theory at least, of free and unlimited toleration? But so it was. A heretic could have been burned at the stake till the year 1677.† "Upon which Blackstone observes, that 'in one

[24] See Note 24.

* Preface to Apology, p. vii.

† Christian Observer, American edition, xiv., 399.

and the same reign, our lands were delivered from the slavery of military tenures, our bodies from arbitrary imprisonment by the Habeas Corpus Act, and our minds from the tyranny of superstitious bigotry, by demolishing this last badge of persecution in the English law.' "* Nor was that quite all. I cannot refrain from adding something further from Mr. Gladstone; since on but the next page he says, "We find, however, some curious facts in the history of the reign of Charles II. It was then that the Earl of Granard procured for the Puritans of Ireland, a pension of 500*l.* ANNUALLY from government; and in 1672 the king issued an order for pensions of 50*l.* and 100*l.* YEARLY to many of the nonconformist ministers."†

So then the abolition of death by fire, of military tenures, and the passage of an Habeas Corpus Act, were the bright visions of heads, which Puritans would once have cleft from their kindred shoulders; and the praise of lavishing gratuities on those whose principles had shed his father's blood, and deluged his native country with misery, belongs to one, whom Puritan anathemas would have hurled with Judas to his own place. Oh, how fitly did the Patriarch David say, "Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord; let me not fall into the hand of man." There may be mercy in the day of judgment, for those who could never find it here.

Before concluding this letter, it may be well to settle one point, which should be borne in mind, in all my comments on Puritan display of principle and conduct. It is this. The Puritans consisted, as Lathbury says,‡ of three distinct parties: the moderate Puritans, who never left the

* Gladstone's State and Church, 4th edition, ii. 231.

† For another specimen of Charles II's liberality, see Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. ii. 266. He gave Dr. Owen a thousand guineas, "to distribute among those who had suffered most by the late severities." And yet his recompense was, to be called "a profligate tyrant."

‡ History English Episcopacy, pp. 54, 55.

Church, the Presbyterians, and the Brownists.[25] But it is from the most violent grade of the three, that our New England Puritans have descended: I mean the Brownists. I well know, that this is a most touchy and ire-provoking point in Puritan story.* The object of their American apologists is studiously to show, that the New England Puritans were descended from the Independents; and from those who were placable and tolerant, as they maintain Robinson of Leyden was. Mr. Young, the compiler of the Chronicles, whom I often quote, knows well enough, that to claim *some* of the Puritans as his ecclesiastical ancestry, would be to boast a pedigree that would do him no honor. And so he warily enters the *caveat*, that the Plymouth Puritans (alas for Boston, Salem, and New Haven!) are the ONLY ONES who merit the name of "Pilgrim."† But the demurrer will not save his precarious cause. Let his claim be granted; the Plymouth "pilgrims" are the direct descendants of Robinson's congregation, as no New Englander will deny. But Robinson left England, as Neal, (who was rebuked by Dr. Watts, for not having "mollified" some of his "relations" of New England history,)‡ as Neal and Belknap both freely admit, "a rigid Brownist."[26] § And that if *he* changed,[27] his *congregation* did not, and probably would not, his earnest farewell

[25] See Note 25. [26] See Note 26. [27] See Note 27.

* It cost poor Britton a terrible flagellation to say as much two hundred years ago. And his pocket would have smarted, too, had it not been empty.—Savage's Winthrop, i. 289, and note. Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 81. Had I seen Mr. Punchard's History of Congregationalism sooner, I might have been saved some trouble. Punchard is not anxious to mince the matter; and when he speaks of Congregationalism "in its embodied form," Brown's name is the *first* he mentions. p. 243. Praise to his honesty!

† Chronicles, p. 88, note.

‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, v. 201.

§ Neal's New England. i. 73. Belknap's Biography, ii. 176.

address to them absolutely demonstrates. "I must also advise you," is his parting counsel—the very end of it as given in Neal and Belknap—"to abandon, avoid, and shake off the name of Brownist. 'Tis a mere nick-name, and a brand for the making religion, and the professors of it, odious to the Christian world." Now, than this address, no higher testimony can possibly be given: it is from one of their own company, and it is unsolicited. It is a "freer profession," by far, than that under which they beguiled Charles I. out of a charter; which, by their own construction of it, embraced "the power of Parliament, King's Bench, Common Pleas, Chancery, High Commission and Star-chamber, and ALL OTHER COURTS OF ENGLAND!"* And, like that charter, it fastens upon them a character as indelible as the brand of the actual cautery. They cannot escape it. They are implored not to be Brownists, at the very moment they are preparing to plant themselves on American soil. Brownists they were, therefore, to that ultimate hour of their European existence; and that, counselled as they might be, they never departed from one of Brownism's worst peculiarities, its utter exclusiveness, let their American existence, a Presbyterian being witness, substantiate.† The name, indeed, of Brownism was abandoned; (they complied with Robinson's charge in the *letter;*) but its spirit—alas its spirit! even at this distant day, do not its vipers come out of many a heat to fasten on apostolic hands? I here allude, among other things, to the harsh

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 84. See also Prince's Annals, p. 57, in Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. vii., after p. 188.

† "What tenets are held by the Independents of New England? They reckon all Reformed Churches, except themselves, profane and unclean" Ross's View of all Religions, pp. 390, 391. In perfect conformity with this, I find Baillie, another Presbyterian, speaking of the "bold wipes" which they give "to *all* the Reformed Churches." Baillie was a member of the Westminster Assembly.—Baillie's Letters, &c., i. 420, Edinburgh Edition, 1775.

assaults upon the present Bishop of Connecticut, for a charge delivered, in the ordinary course of duty, to the clergy of his own diocese—a prelate who has meekness enough, (if it could be *imputed* to them,) to make amiable even reviewers in the testy "New Englander."

P. S.—With writers like Punchard to deal with, some of my labor might have been spared altogether; for, on further examination, I find him yielding the contested point, without a struggle. He explicitly says, "it is evident from this account of Brownism, that, in its essential features, it corresponded with Congregationalism, as since established in New England." (History of Cong., p. 248.) So the Hon. F. C. Gray admits it. He says, in good round terms, "Our ancestors were of the strictest sect of the Puritans." —Mass. Hist. Col. 3d Ser. viii. 198.

LETTER III.

Having thus sketched, as my limits allow, something of the origin and aim of Puritanism in England, my next object will be to offer some developments, (development being now a fashionable doctrine,) of its temper and treatment there. Of course I have unavoidably given some hints of these things, in an oblique way already; but the more formal consideration of them is necessary for my purpose, before tracing the career of Puritanism in this land of its ultimate supremacy.

The credulity of human nature, respecting those who claim the honor of being persecuted, has been imposed upon, most egregiously, by statements respecting the inoffensive-

ness of the Puritans, and the ferocity of their opponents. Take such a specimen as the following, from the pen of Dr. Morse, which was long ago reiterated in England, in his own words, (I quote an English edition of his Geography of 1792,) and has been resounded since on a million of tongues. "During the successive reigns of Henry VIII., Mary, Elizabeth, and James I., the Protestants, and especially the Puritans, were the objects of bloody persecution, and thousands of them were either inhumanly burnt, or left more cruelly to perish in prisons and dungeons." (Geog. p. 150.) Could any thing well be more disingenuous, or artful, than this? Why, under the fury of the "bloody Mary," but 277* are said to have been put to death. And yet, here are Protestants and Puritans identified; the Romish violence which persecuted the one is represented as persecuting the other; while in suffering, the Puritans have an "especial" pre-eminence, and of course in the number of their noble army of martyrs.[28] It inevitably follows, that Puritans have endured far more, as Puritans, from the Church of England, than Protestants have endured, as Protestants, from the Church of Rome. And if Papal Rome may lawfully be detested and execrated, Episcopal England may be much more so.[29] Yes, this is the genuine result at which Puritan historians aim. Read Neal on the Puritans, or Bogue and Bennet's History of Dissenters, and if you do not hate poor Ap. Laud worse than the worst of all the Popes, it is because an adept in his art is unable to prejudice you.[30] For, as to recklessness of statement, Dr. Morse, with his thousands of Puritans slaughtered by Elizabeth and by James, (he leaves the two Charleses entirely out of his category,) does not much exceed the Puritan annalist. As to accuracy in numbers, Neal can

[28] See Note 28. [29] See Note 29. [30] See Note 30.

* Grier's Defence of his reply to Bishop Milner, p. 388.

assuredly match him; for he can magnify *one* into a hundred.[31] And as to dexterity in glozing over an awkward fact, he could represent a sacrilegious assault upon the tomb of an Ap. of Canterbury, and the tossing of its bones upon a dunghill, as a bare "removal" of those venerable relics (Parker's not Laud's) "by a private gentleman."* No wonder the world should suppose, that Puritans have perished by hundreds and by thousands, rather than in a ratio one hundred times lower, and that they should have so perished, with an innocence as stainless as that, with which a Puritan apologist would whiten a dastardly violator of the sacred sleep of the dead.

All this is very possible, and very successful too, so far as America is concerned; for here there are few indeed, who so much as suspect that there is aught but poetry or pathos in the departure of the Puritans from Europe, and their establishment in "these goings down of the sun." Let an American Churchman ask, where he may find an antidote for the long and every year lengthened story of Puritan vicissitudes and afflictions, and he will learn with astonishment, that the object of his search retreats before him like the fabled cup of Tantalus. Neal's volumes, with a train of satellites long and flaring as a comet's tail, fill the whole field of vision here. One might roam through our twenty-seven dioceses, and scarcely get twenty-seven answers to the question, What sort of a book is Walker's Sufferings of the

[31] See Note 31.

---

* Maddox, 343, 344.—This instance was so flagrant, Neal had to correct it; but he tried to do away the force of the concession, by adding "says Mr. Strype:" which he knew would be enough; Strype being one of "the malignant party."—Neal's editor puts in, as a set-off, that some twenty Puritan ministers were dug up. That is nothing to the purpose. The point in hand was Neal's garbling; and we see how wretchedly he mended the matter, after all.—Neal, i. 348.

Clergy, or Gauden's Tears and Sighs of the Church of England? The works of Bp. Maddox, in answer to Neal's first volume, and of Dr. Zachary Grey, in answer to the rest, are rarer than black swans. After ten years' search, a single copy of Bp. Maddox's work has fallen into my hands; while the work of Dr. Grey eludes me still. I never saw but *one* complete copy of both; though I have had access to at least a hundred thousand volumes, in different public libraries.

Where an American work can be pointed out, with which to combat the thickening and concentrating appeals of champions of Puritanic grievances, let one of our clergy ask, and the meagerness of the answers he obtains must soon make him sigh and wonder. He might dig for the gold of Robert Kidd in the sands of Montauk, with about as much hope as to search for Eleutherius Enervatus, for the defence of our Church by Jeremiah Leaming, or for that copy of Leslie on Episcopacy, to which is annexed the grim tale of John Checkley's sorrows. Checkley published that book at Boston, about one hundred and twenty years ago.* But little guessed he of the perils of the fateful effort. He was sued as a false and scandalous libeller—found guilty—amerced in a heavy fine—and bound with two strong sureties, in a good round sum, to keep the peace; and this, and all this, for his gracious Majesty's sake, because he had defended his Majesty's religion! and all done too, beneath the droppings of that sanctuary of liberty, Faneuil Hall, Boston!! Tell it not in Gath—Episcopacy was once sentenced as an outrageous libel, by those whose forefathers had dared to admonish Parliament, before the face of a Tudor, to cast it out as evil.† Among essays no longer in danger of the mace of a Puritan court of justice, I know scarce any thing,

* Eliot's Biog. Dict. pp. 105, 106.

† In New England, barely to petition for the repeal of a hard law, was a grievous crime against the state; and a sin against God, because it violated the fifth Commandment.—Sav. Wint. i. 301.

but the papers of Dr. Jarvis, now out of sight in the forgotten Gospel Advocate; but which are well deserving of perpetuation as a tract. They are said to have produced no faint impression, respecting the partiality of Webster's famous Plymouth Discourse, for which they were a designed corrective; and that fact, if nothing else, should redeem them from oblivion.

So much, by way of prelibation. Let us now enter more into detail; and in order to have a fair view of our subject, commence with the prologue of the Puritan drama, in the time of Edward VI. And here my readers must by no means forget a point, which enters deeply into this defence of Episcopacy, (for defence it truly is, and not voluntary aggression; the opinion of our "Dissenting Brethren"—to use the old name given them by Presbyterians—to the contrary notwithstanding,) which is, that the Puritans were at first any thing but a homogeneous or harmonious body.* Puritanism was an affair of development, systematic enough to suit Dr. Mœhler. True, it might be said to have resembled the teil-tree, and the oak, whose substance is in them when they have no leaves. Nevertheless, that substance did not manifest itself in full, till the days came, when, as I have said, they were branch as well as root men. Puritanism was justified, at first, but partially. And so long as it was so justified, and by men who would not justify it at all lengths, and at all hazards, it was connived at, or borne with, if not formally tolerated.

The case of Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, fully establishes my assertion. Hooper had fled from the Six Articles of Henry VIII., and sought repose in the embraces of Bullinger, minister of the Protestants at Zurich, after the death of Zuinglius in battle. Chameleon-

* Haweis' Church History, loose enough in itself, and edited by a Puritan, p. 115, admits this.—Printed at Worcester, Mass. 1803.

like, he caught the color of his ecclesiastical associations; and returned with a passion for stark simplicity. He protested against the use of the Episcopal robes, when about to be consecrated; though he seems not to have had a single scruple about the Episcopal office, and was as firm a believer in the Apostolic Succession, as later Puritans in the manifold powers of the "Gifted Brethren." Possibly he was a little proud of his plainness, as Plato told Diogenes he was of his rags. For sure I am, I have seen as thorough and exclusive pride, beneath a broad brim, wide flaps, and a strait collar, as under the satin and lace of a Romish prelate. Indeed, as a shrewd writer has observed, Satan himself regards, as his darling sin, "the pride that apes humility." But be the matter as it might, the King (aye, his Majesty's own self) wrote to the bishops, to endure Hooper's scruples. Fortunately, the bishops induced him, after earnest expostulation, to wear habiliments to which some imagined Popery would cleave like the small-pox—at least to wear them on *public occasions.* His Lordship's reverence acted, at other times, as suited his own fancy.

Similar favor was shown old Miles Coverdale, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. When he was summoned to officiate at the consecration of Abp. Parker, (the prelate with whose name the Romanists have linked their rancid parable of the Nag's Head tavern,) he shrunk from Episcopal drapery, with the same sensitiveness which had afflicted the epidermis of his Rt. Rev. brother. Well, he was even allowed, on a most memorable *public* occasion, to lay his robes aside, and appear in something like a Calvinistic gown.*

* Mather acknowledges that a solitary act of conformity would have saved John Cotton. (See Magnalia, i. 237.) And, still, the man who would not yield in one minute particular himself, afterwards defended persecution unto blood. Cotton wrote that book, whose very title is blasphemous, "The Bloody Tenet washed and made white in the Blood of the Lamb." Such was Puritan consistency; and such were the men

The well-known John Fox, author of the Acts and Monuments, is a third instance; and quite sufficient, (to say nothing of Humphrey, Perkins, Stone, Dod, Rainolds, &c., the last honored as one of the commission to make a new translation of the Scriptures,) to show that the policy with which the Government began in the days of Hooper, was still pursued, and would be pursued, so long as similar subjects only required discipline. Fox was summoned by the Primate of all England and Metropolitan, to subscribe the Liturgy, Articles, and Canons. But the sturdy old nonconformist thrust a New Testament into his face; and said he would subscribe that, and that alone. "I have nothing," said he, "in the Church, but a prebend at Salisbury; and much good may it do you, if you will take it away from me."* This was very bold bearing to the highest magnate in the land; and doubtless he repented for it at his leisure, in the dungeons of the Tower. Not at all. He died quietly in his nest;† for nonconformist though he were, yet an out and out Puritan he was not; since, says Fuller, "he never entered a church without expressing solemn reverence therein."

But the whole of the story is not yet told. Ap. Parker, a haughty prelatist, and Elizabeth, a queen who rebuked Parliaments with scanty ceremony, could pitifully endure

who complained of Archbishop Laud's policy! But my readers will have enough more on this point, before we get through.—Most appositely has Dr. Dwight expressed his opinion about the opposition of the Puritans to ceremonies, and his suspicion of some concealed motive for their revolutionary conduct. "I will acknowledge, also, that our ancestors were more solicitous about the surplice, and the ceremonies, than their importance required; *if, indeed, these were the real causes of their solicitude.*" —Travels, i. 161.

* Fuller's Church History, new edition, ii. 475.

† Neal, utterly at a loss for a charitable reason to account for the kindness shown Father Fox by the Government, says they were *afraid* to turn him out. See Maddox's Vind. pp. 144, 145; and Neal, i. 236.

Fox's vexatious scruples; but nonconformists denounced him for his moderation. His own theological kindred became his persecutors. There was enough of church-leaven left in him, to spoil him for a headlong partisan; and his severest wound came, accordingly, from his so-called friends. A son of Fox had returned from his travels, to enjoy a fellowship at Oxford University. Puritans, who happened to be in the majority there, (another proof, by the way, how slow the Government was to dislodge them,)* forthwith fastened upon him the label of Papist, and had him hunted, like a wild beast, from the University precincts. This they did, that the poor fond father might be pierced through his innocent child. Such malignity roused even Fox's placid soul; and in a long letter to a bishop, he thus remonstrates against the spite of his foes. "It has always, I confess, been my great care, if I could not be serviceable to many persons, yet not knowingly to injure any one, and least of all those of Magdalen College. I cannot, therefore, but the more wonder, at the turbulent genius which inspires those *factious Puritans;* so that violating the laws of gratitude, despising my letters and prayers, disregarding the intercession of the President himself, [Humphrey, unfortunately a moderate nonconformist like Fox,] without any previous admonition, or assigning any cause, they have exercised so great tyranny against me and my son. Were I one, who, like them, would be *violently outrageous* against bishops and archbishops; or join myself with them, that is, would become mad, as they are, I had not met with this severe treatment. Now, because quite different from them, I have chosen the side of modesty and public tranquillity, hence, the hatred they have for a long time conceived against me, is at last grown to this degree of bitter-

* The Puritans had a foothold, it seems, at Oxford. So also had they in Cambridge. Cotton Mather speaks of "Emanuel College, that Seminary of Puritans in Cambridge."—Magnalia, i. 323.

ness." The letter was in Latin, and may be found in Fuller, with some pertinent comments. The translation above, is from the Gen. Historical Dict. of Bernard, Birch, and Lockman, vol. v. 302, 303.

Beside such testimony, let me now ask, Who then had most need to pray for deliverance "from envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness,"—the Government, or the Government's opponents; who, as "Father Fox" said in another part of his remonstrance, would never desist, till they had "brought all things into Jewish bondage?" But I need not enlarge upon a point, which such cases as have been adduced and a multitude more, all conspire to illustrate.* These are ample, especially when associated with a communication such as that of Sir Francis Walsingham, and which Dr. Jarvis has most appositely quoted from Burnet's Reformation, vol. ii. (it may be found also in Collier, vii. 75,) to well warrant the Dr. in his conclusion, "that, with regard to the moderate party of the Puritans, there was the greatest disposition in the rulers of the Church to exercise indulgence."† If any thing then be wanting, it is supplied by a fact he next advances, Queen Elizabeth's offer, (though Neal, i. 177, perversely represents her as more concerned for the Papists than the Puritans,) to acquiesce in an omission of the three superlatively dismal exactions, *viz.* kneeling at the Communion, wearing the surplice, and using the sign of the cross in Baptism; *provided*, there were due conformity, in things not quite so tremendously insupportable.‡ Yes, even old Queen Bess was most politely conciliatory; though her temperament, as a Tudor, was of course imperious, and though, with other ladies, she might have

* Even Bishop Burnet does not spare them, though, as his castigator Mr. Higgons shows, he was under no small temptation to pass their failures over lightly.—Higgons against Burnet, 2d edition, 1727, pp. 30, 31.

† Gospel Advocate, ii. 62, 63.

‡ See Collier, vii. 16.

been expected to be somewhat punctilious as to attitudes and dresses. Or, if such a fact require confirmation strong as proof of Holy Writ, nothing more could be necessary than the shrewd proposition of Lord Burleigh, that, if the Puritans did not like the Church Liturgy, they should agree among themselves upon one they *could* like; or the liberal concessions of Charles II., just preceding the Savoy Conference.*

In view of such evidence, a man must be voracious in appetite, and fastidious in digestion, beyond all reasonable dyspeptic liberty, if he could still demand proof of the lenient and courteous disposition of the Government towards all who were moderate and gentlemanly, in their objections and petitions for reform.[32] That they treated a hirsute and greedy generation, which would have handled them and their institutions "with the paw of the lion and the paw of the bear," with less amenity, may not be, possibly, among the world's seven wonders. "It is easy to talk of toleration," says the Quarterly Review, "and say that the Church should have tolerated these schismatics: THEY WOULD NOT TOLERATE THE CHURCH."[33] † And, again, on the self-same page, "They taught that, 'If princes hinder them who seek for the discipline, they are tyrants both to the Church and ministers; and, being so, may be deposed by their subjects.' Thus completely," it adds, and let modern Puritans weigh the observation well, "did POPERY and PURITANISM meet in the political deductions, from their presumed infallibility."‡ So great and so candid a man as Sully, and as good a Protestant as their hottest zealot,

[32] See Note 32. [33] See Note 33.

* Cardwell's Conferences, 286, &c. Short's Church History, ii. 230, 231.

† Vol. x. 96.

‡ Compare Featley on the Anabaptists, edit. 6th, p. 35.

thought England was well and happily provided for, by such a Church as he saw there. He attended its services, when he visited England on a diplomatic mission. He did not hesitate to declare, "that if the French Protestants had retained the same advantages of order and decency, there would at that time have been many thousand more Protestants in France."* But that which was order and decency, in this great man's eyes, was confusion and pollution—I must appeal to Fox again—in the eyes of a mad faction. They could see no beauty in the Church of England, why they should desire her; and their watchword was that of the children of Edom, in the day of Jerusalem, Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof. (Ps. cxxxvii. 7.)

Could any profit ensue, from attempts at further and fuller conciliation with men of a temper like this? If demonstration upon demonstration is wanted, let us see what results did actually follow, from the attempts which were made in fact.

What, for example, was the reply to Elizabeth's tender of compromise, respecting the three points which were as shocking as the three heads of Cerberus to an ancient Pagan? With a tact at identification and interpretation, monopolized by themselves, they adopted the language of the Israelites to Pharaoh, *Ne ungulam esse relinquendam*—not a hoof shall be left behind.† Historians generally, I believe, quote the Latin; but whether it is their own, or not, I cannot say. If the Puritans themselves used it, so as not to offend ears polite, Bishop Milner should have adduced them, in his "End of Controversy," to prove that miracles have not ceased. Or, if another specimen illustrating their capa-

* Quarterly Review, x. 94.

† It is admitted by Bancroft, that they denied the propriety of *every* vestment and *every* ceremony. And Fuller cites a case, where a minister was arraigned for saying even the Gloria Patri.—Bancroft's America, i. 278. Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 483.

bilities in pure vernacular is wished, a parallel can be quoted from that matchless Puritan classic, the "Anatomy of the Service-Booke." "As they are altars of Baal, erected and maintained by Baalites and Balaamites, so they, and all their ceremoniall accoutrements, and the Service-Booke itself, are an abomination: witness that place of Exodus already quoted, 'The abominations of the Egyptians shall we sacrifice to Jehovah our God?' saith Moses to Pharaoh. 'It is not meet so to do.' "* The Puritans, says Toulmin, (Neal's editor, who, if possible, is less candid than Neal himself: for the prejudices of both a Unitarian and a Baptist were welded together in him,) had "some intervals of ease," even under Elizabeth's government.† Was it during "intervals of ease," that their harassed souls relieved themselves with such *jeux d'esprit* as this?

What state of things did Lord Burleigh's astute proposal bring to light? Why, to liturgy-making they went, with characteristic vehemence. It seems the wary statesman had asked them, if they wanted to annihilate the Church liturgy. Oh no: they only wanted the old one remodelled. Let my readers note here, that the Puritans confessed themselves, as Baxter said for himself long afterwards, "not averse to a settled form."‡ Well, their favorite model, chiselled and squared after the Geneva pattern, like Baxter's "Reformed Liturgy"[34] presented to the Savoy Conference, was ushered into light. This was the bantling of the first *classis*. Their second *classis* were displeased with it, to such a merciless extent, that they altered it in *six hundred particulars!* The third classis protested against

[34] See Note 34.

* The Anatomy, p. 17. † Neal, i. 298, note.

‡ Short's Hist. ii. 236.—Baxter's Cure of Church Divisions, p. 176, etc. 2d edit. 1670. Indeed his Reformed Liturgy settles the question as to his opinions.

this, and declared war upon it. The fourth *classis* were not easier to please, than their predecessors—asserted their own fancies, and fought for them, *pugnis et calcibus, unguibus et rostro.* And what then did Lord Burleigh do? Did he cast their dissensions into their teeth, and bestow merited commendations on their positive and negative electricity, their sparks and fire? Not quite. Though an aristo crat, and a Churchman, he bowed them out of doors with a courtier's suavity. "Good sirs, when you can agree among yourselves, the Government will receive your proposals with distinguished consideration." And so, says Hammond, quaintly but pithily, "the dissenting of those brethren, like the division of tongues at Babel, was a fair means to keep that tower, then, from advancing any higher.*

How did they requite such unwarlike consideration as this, but three years after [1588], when Spain's Armada, with its furious legions, threatened to descend on England like the locusts of Joel, and make "all faces gather blackness?" Now we say, now surely, horror of Popery, innate and unconquerable in a Puritan breast, will unite them with the Powers that be against the common foe. They will forget lighter grievances, in the perils of the constitution. They will fight for Protestantism, like the Scythians for the tombs of their forefathers. Alas, it might not be! They detested an Episcopal queen for England, more than a Romish vicar for the universe. Plainly and sternly, does history tell the shameful tale of Puritan disloyalty. "Though," says Carwithen, "the Armada, vauntingly styled the invincible, was confessedly prepared to bring England back to the catholic faith, and though the Romanists in England composed a formidable body, yet Elizabeth found, that her most dangerous enemies were not among her Romish sub-

* Hammond's Works, i. 359. See also for this anecdote, Fuller, iii. 48, 78. Collier, vii. 16. Maddox, 283.

jects. In this time of common danger, the Puritans forgot their antipathy to the Papists, and were indefatigable in dispersing libels against the Church and her prelates."*

And what benefit, lastly, flowed from the concessions of King Charles? The four months which were allowed for the Savoy Conference debates, were wasted to no purpose. Of the Magnus Apollo of the Puritans, (Richard Baxter,) the candid and accurate Mr., now Bishop, Short says, "he earnestly desired peace; but it was only on his own terms, and he would concede nothing to his opponents."† He did not remember his own precious rebuke, in other days, to the Anabaptists and Independents, when illustrating the perils and excesses of sectarism. "And all this began in unwarrantable separation, and too much aggravating the faults of the churches, and common people and Common Prayer Book, and ministry; which indeed were none of them without faults to be lamented and amended. But they thought, that whatever needed amendment, required their *obstinate separation* [Baxter's own italics]; and that they were allowed to make odious any thing that was amiss."§

> O that the Lord the gift would gie us,
> To see ourselves as ithers see us!

Baxter could easily perceive that the sectaries needed amendment, rather than the Prayer Book with its "ceremoniall accoutrements." But that Richard Baxter needed a similar amendment, rather than the same venerable volume, was an invisible impossibility. No: all the sectaries, with

* History of the Church of England, ii. 136. Soames' Elizabeth, p. 370. British Critic, xiii. 34. Grant's English Church, i. 456.

† Short's Hist. ii. 249.—He and his party begged, says L'Estrange, like sturdy cripples, with cudgels in their hands.—Holy Cheat, 3d edition, p. 81.

§ Calamy's Life of Baxter abridged, i. 95.

Anabaptists and Independents to flank them, were utterly wrong on this hand, and the Bishops, with all their formularies and ceremonies, were utterly wrong on that. There was but one infallible centre, which rested on the shoulders of Richard Baxter! There is a solitary head in the city of seven hills, which entertaineth the same hallucination.

But be all this as it may, say the Puritans, there is one thing in the reign of King Charles, for which no apology can avail. The Act of Uniformity—O the Act of Uniformity, consummated on that awful day of the month, the 24th of August, when the Huguenots were massacred in France—that direful, desolating act, which thrust two thousand "godly and painfull" ministers from their comfortable livings, upon a cold world's charity—that act may almost or quite resemble one, which cannot be forgiven in this world or in the world to come.

This act wipes out all which Charles ever did, or could do, a thousand times told, deserving of praise, and sends him down to posterity, on Puritan pages, as very a demon as the royal assassin of the Festival of St. Bartholomew. O when one sees this, it were enough to make him exclaim, as did the great prime minister Walpole, when somebody wanted to read him history, 'No, no, read me something true.' It seems almost impossible to believe, *a priori*, that the truth respecting this matter could be so thoroughly garbled, or so effectually kept out of sight, as it has been. Two thousand "godly and painfull" ministers dispossessed of their livings? Why, the Puritans themselves dispossessed probably ten thousand of the ministers of the Church of England.* These two thousand, also, were interlopers—not even ecclesiastical squatters, as we Americans would say—absolute interlopers, who had driven away the lawful shepherds of the flock, and were covering themselves with the fleece, full warmly. The

* Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy, Pt. i. p. 200.

ministers of the Church of England were the real victims of banishment;[35] and the Act of Uniformity was but an act of simple justice, to give them back their own. Nor would they have got their own, if the Two Thousand had not been induced to listen to the insidious counsels of their nominal enemies, but old colleagues, the Papists. "It is stated that the Catholics secretly encouraged the Presbyterians in their determination. That part of the court which was under Catholic influence, persuaded the Presbyterians to continue firm, and that either the act would be modified, or the King would screen them from its effects."* The Romanists were grievously disappointed. The Act of Uniformity in Charles's day, like that in Elizabeth's day,† was a trium phant overthrow of papal machinations; and if the Puritans were the victims, Elizabeth's act was not the first, nor Charles's the last, by which they have suffered from an unholy dalliance with the woman in scarlet. Puritans are, by multitudes, presumed to be what they claim to be—the remotest opposites of Popery. But extremes meet.‡ Puritans and Papists united in the reigns of former English sovereigns, as we have seen them united in this century, for the downfall of Protestant monarchs. Jesuits have preached

[35] See Note 35.

---

* Lathbury, p. 324.—So Collier, vii. 454, note. And all is easily explicable upon the Romish principle of action, mentioned by Burnet. "There was nothing which the whole Popish party feared, more than an union of those of the Church of England with the Presbyterians."—Burnet's own Times, i. 110, edit. 1724.

† Lathbury, p. 61.

‡ "I have often heard some wise men say," is Archbishop Laud's own testimony, "that the Jesuit in the Church of Rome, and the precise party in the Reformed Churches, agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one, &c."—Conference with Fisher, p. 81.

in Puritan pulpits, to prove the Liturgy as bad as the Mass-Book; and Puritans have said *Amen.** Jesuits have fought Puritan battles.† Jesuits have fought their own battles against Protestants, and Puritans have given them succor. The days of the Irish Massacre must be interpreted by those of the Spanish Armada.[36] ‡ And if "the thing that hath been, is that which shall be, and that which is done, is that which shall be done," (Eccl. i. 9,) such apparent contrarieties may exist again. They may indeed. England's worst enemies are not the Tractarians of Oxford. If her Church falls, it will be because, between Dissenters on one side and Romanists on the other, she has sunk beneath the revival of old conspiracies. Herod and Pilate became friends to crucify the world's Redeemer. She may be crucified by some such monstrous combination, when, otherwise, she might live till time's last sands shall fall.[37] §

A few things more, and this sketch will end. We have seen how the authorities of England talked with Puritans: let us compare a few more specimens of Puritan *curiosa felicitas*, with the style of lordlings, monarchs, and queens. Dr. Jarvis has preserved some striking instances, which should be laid up in the archives of every defender of Episcopacy, against the hours now coming, thick and fast, when it will

[36] See Note 36. [37] See Note 37.

---

* Romish Fox and Sectarian Firebrands, pp. 97, 137, 183. Dublin, 1683.—"The disciples of Rome and of Geneva united in inveighing, with the utmost bitterness, against the English Liturgy."—Blackstone's Comm. iv. 50 or 51.

† Dugdale, 564.

‡ Miller's Phil. of Hist. iii. 441. Lingard, x. 106, 1st Amer. ed.—Tytler's Hist, ii. 404–5. Eikon Basilike, p. 100, or chap. xii. Swift's Works, xiv. 71, 72. Dugdale, 74, 76. Leland's Ireland, iii. 136.

§ Compare South's prophecy, uttered A. D. 1662. Sermons, iii. 447, 448. Oxford, 1823.

be necessary to tell its oppugners to look at home. The conforming clergy were styled "petty popes, popelings, antichrists, dumb dogs, idle drones."[38] Bishops were "bawds to all kinds of sinners." They were also "presumptuous, paltry, pestilent usurpers, cogging and cozening knaves." They would "lie like dogs," and were "monstrous ungodly wretches, that, to maintain their own outrageous proceedings, mingle heaven and earth together;" or in the more graphic, but not less bitter imitatives of the New Englander, provide "a sacramental way to hell." The Archbishop of Canterbury was "a very antichristian beast, a most vile and cursed tyrant."[39] The Quakers can here see the original of that habit of execrating, which so often applied the tremendous word "cursed" to them in after days, and even under the solemn forms of statute law. I will not go on; for here is enough to nauseate any liberal mind, be its principles anti-episcopal to their very core. Yet it is a meager, a very meager tithe, of the scum which might be gathered.*

It will be somewhat hard to believe, that such language was not accompanied by kindred actions. It was perhaps outstripped by those who spit out such harpy-like impurity. Yes, clergymen were mobbed, and dragged, even out of

[38] See Note 38. [39] See Note 39.

* Much of the scum alluded to comes from the tracts of Martin Marprelate, and other *anonymous* publications. These, the Puritans often find it convenient to disclaim. (Pierce's Vindication, pp. 118, 119.) But a writer in the Christian Remembrancer for April, 1845, keenly remarks, that *anonymous* publications were a truer index of their temper, than any others; for there they spoke without disguise, and less fear of the courts. He shows, too, how lame their excuse for throwing off the authorship of Martin, when his tracts had failed. The Church wits answered him in his own style, and he was driven off the ground. Then, as a living dog is better than a dead lion, even Martin's best friends disowned him.—Christian Remembrancer, 1845, vol. ix. pp. 365, 405, 406. See also Fuller's Church History, iii. 98.

churches, because robed in surplices. The sacred symbols of the Eucharist were swept from altars,* about to be surrounded by peaceable communicants.† "Presbyteries," says Dr. Jarvis, "were formed in every part of the kingdom; disaffected lecturers and tutors obtained entrance into the universities, to corrupt the students; and itinerant preachers went through the country, to prejudice the minds of the people against liturgy-conforming ministers and bishops." And among the most heinous of the many sins of these ministers and bishops, did they pronounce to be, a belief in the freedom of the human will! *that* sin proved them to be Papists, beyond the possibility of contradiction—Papists of the most malignant dye.‡ To crown the climax, and without naming a hundred intervening steps, they avowedly maintained, that "the Church of England as it standeth now by law established, professeth not a true Christ, nor a true religion; that it hath no ministers indeed, nor sacraments indeed;"§ [O remember this, ye who denounce Churchmen for questions about the validity of a ministry and sacraments, not known to them as apostolical;] and "the presbytery and eldership may, for some causes, after admonition, if there ensue no cause of reformation, EXCOMMUNICATE THE QUEEN!"|| "The mad enthusiasts," says Dr. Nichols, "then proceed to anoint Hacket, in the name of the Lord Jesus, with the Holy Ghost, the queen having forfeited her crown, and being worthy to be deprived; and in the solemn

* Or *tables*, if my readers prefer: I have no Puseyitish inklings for the word *altar*. I am astonished, however, at the outcry against it, especially as the Methodists constantly use it.

† Collier's Eccl. Hist. vi. 435.

‡ Maddox's Vindication, pp. 123, &c.

§ Such was the outrageous doctrine held, even in the Admonition to Parliament. Lathbury, p. 64. See also Fuller's Church History, ii. 475. Gilby's horrid opinions.

|| Gospel Advocate, ii. 64, 86.

manner as is used in the inauguration of princes, he is proclaimed by his followers, through Cheapside, not only king of this nation, but of all Europe."*

I add to these a few illustrations of their language respecting the Liturgy, and in their own sermons.

Of the Liturgy[40] let us see what they say, in a single chapter, on its most reverend and impassioned part, the Litany, but which the "Anatomy of the Service-Booke" styles "not the least sinful, but rather the most offensive." "Of this," it goes on to observe, "it may truly be said, as one said of the Pharisees' sinne, that it was either the sinne of the Holy Ghost, or a sinne very nigh it; so the Letany is either blasphemie, or very nigh blasphemie." And again: "Now this Letany is a very fascinating fardel of tautologies and Battologies, besides its other faults. In this Letany there is *Lord deliver us*, eight times, *Hear, we beseech thee*, twenty times,† to omit many desires to be delivered from things, from which there is not the least appearance, no more than of the [a word too indecent to be written,] the danger of being drunk at a Whitson-ale, or having a purse cut at a stage-play, and not so much. Againe, after a tautologicall summing up and repetition, of the titles and Elogies of the Trinity, tossed with responses, they fall on in a heathenish way to act the word Letany, or Maggany,‡ as it is well ren-

[40] See Note 40.

---

* Nichols' Defence of the Church of England, p. 31, 3d edition. London, 1730. Du Pin, Dublin edition, iii. p. 662.

Some of the Puritans would disclaim Hacket, just as they would Martin Marprelate. But the same logic which makes Churchmen responsible for Laud's severities, makes them responsible for Hacket's fanaticism.

† In the 136th Psalm there is, "for his mercy endureth for ever" twenty-six times: almost enough to cover both.

‡ From the Greek *magganon*, I suppose; i. e. a philter, or drug, to charm or stupefy.

dered, namely as it were to conjure; and as if the Divell were now to be dispossest, they would use the very same pieces, namely, 'By the mysterie of thy holy incarnation; by thy holy nativity and circumcision; by thy baptism, fasting, and temptation; by thine agony and bloody sweat; by thy crosse and passion; by thy precious death and buriall; and by the comming of the Holy Ghost, Good Lord deliver us."* I well remember the horror with which a descendant of the Puritans narrated to me Dr. Channing's profane caricature of these awful appeals to Christ, in his Sermon at New-York, Dec. 7, 1826, and of which he was a hearer. Little did he suspect, or I either at the time, that his own ecclesiastical predecessors had blasphemed them worse than an actual Socinian![41]

Now for a sample of their preaching. "There was a sermon *licensed* and *printed* in 1645, in which is this triumph: "O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is gracious, and his mercy endureth for ever; who remembered us at *Naseby*, for his mercy endureth for ever; who remembered us in *Pembrokeshire*, for his mercy endureth for ever; who remembered us at *Leicester*, for his mercy endureth for ever; who remembered us at *Taunton*, for his mercy endureth for ever; who remembered us at *Bristol*, for his mercy endureth for ever."[42] † So then, it seems, repetitions are very admissible, if only employed by the right party; nay, even the Bible itself may be travestied to glorify Puritan victories. And the same treatment (happy is it for Churchmen the Bible itself cannot plead exemption, or the abuse would be justified) has the Prayer-Book experienced, from the same

[41] See Note 41. [42] See Note 42.

* The Anatomy, pp. 39, 40.—Even Baxter could not endure abuse of the Litany, and rebukes it. Cure of Church Divisions, p. 188.

† Walker's Sufferings, Pt. i. p. 18.

lawless tongues. One of the Puritan preachers, "to encourage his auditors to bring in liberally, upon the propositions for money, horse and plate, upon his administration of the Sacrament, began thus, 'All you that have contributed to the Parliament, come and take this Sacrament to your comfort.'"*

This letter is already very long, and much lengthened by these quotations. But I fear it may fall into hands, for which references, however authoritative, may be no help; and I accordingly give another quotation from Lathbury, to show how the disciples of those who thus taught from the pulpit, treated houses of public worship.

"In some cathedrals the public records were burnt: some of these venerable structures were converted into stables. Horses were lodged in St. Paul's Church and in St. George's Chapel at Windsor. When the body of Charles was deposited in the royal chapel, the carving of the stalls was torn off, and stakes were driven into the ground, for the purpose of securing the horses of the soldiers. In some places, horses and swine were baptized in derision. At Westminster, the soldiers drank and smoked at the altar; the brass tablets on the pavement, as is still evident, were torn up and sold; the king's arms were removed from the churches, as marks of Antichrist, and the commandments replaced by the covenant. The surplices were torn, as remnants of Babylon; and the books of Common Prayer were, in many places, burnt as Popish mass-books. By these militant saints, the worship of the English Church was classed with Popery. The communion-plate was plundered: and in many instances the fonts were used as troughs for the troopers' horses.† At Warwick, Colchester, and

* Dugdale's Short View, p. 566.

† They performed also mock baptisms; and these shocking profanenesses, Mr. Robinson says, were palmed off upon the Baptists.—Robinson's Hist. Baptists, pp. 413, 414.

other places, the sanctuaries of the dead were violated, for the purpose of making merchandize of the leaden coffins: the hair was torn from the bodies of Lady Lucas and Lady Killigrew, and worn in their hats by the mob, by way of triumph. At Winchester, the bones of some of the bishops were strewn about the pavement: and at Sudley, the pulpit was converted into shambles for meat. In allusion to the churches being used as stables, it was wittily observed, that they had a thorough reformation in England, for that even horses went to church. At Canterbury, the soldiers stabbed the arras hangings in the choir, on which was the figure of the Saviour: 'Here is Christ,' said one, 'I will stab him.' In Westminster, where the soldiers were actually quartered, they wore the surplice at the game of hare and hounds; he who wore the surplice being the hare."*

And such was Puritanism in the days of its glory beyond the seas. We are yet to remark its temper and triumphs here. Meanwhile, I close with a comment upon its English history, by a journal, whose evangelical instructions have often been lauded by the lips, and paid for by the money of Puritans. May they take its lessons upon their own faith, into their inmost hearts; and they will have made a purchase, the most profitable perhaps of their lives. "Let the documents even of Queen Elizabeth's reign be fairly consulted; let the commendations of Wyatt's rebellion, in the preceding reign, be considered; let the various positions of Knox, Goodman, and others, be properly weighed; and little doubt will remain, how early, and how deeply, this POLITICAL LEAVEN began to work. The Bible was made to serve a purpose it was never intended to serve. And in the rejection of all human wisdom, all ecclesiastical authority, all primitive examples, (which it is true had been much

* Lathbury's Eng. Epis. p. 190.—Compare Bishop Hall's Hard Measure. Works. i. p. lv.

abused by the Papists,) they devised from the Scriptures alone, a new system of their own ; set up as supreme, their own self-constituted authority ; and gave a fresh and grand, but negative example, of zeal without prudence, loyalty without obedience, purity without peace, and religion without amity."

I can pardon many doubts, and no little staring, in some of my readers ; but I give them my solemn assurance, that I have quoted from no lower authority than the CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.[43] *

LETTER IV.

In my last letter, an attempt was made to show that the Puritans were treated in England with a consideration which is not unacknowledged only, but firmly denied. I also showed then, that this consideration was requited with incessant hostility, breaking out, where occasion offered, into lawless violence,[44] or undoubted treason.[45] Well does Prof. Ranke say, in allusion to the insatiate turbulence of Puritanical times, "It seemed as if the violent excitement which had caused such long, universal and perpetually recurring conflicts in the Protestant world at large, was now concentrated in the English Puritans."† Here is impartial testimony to prove, that all the fevers of the age, which might have spent their force, if scattered among a hundred

[43] See Note 43. [44] See Note 44. [45] See Note 45.

* See vol. for 1815, p. 471, American edition, the close of a review of Brooks' Lives of the Puritans.

† On the Popes, ii. 123.

or two of sects, had now, as a sort of forlorn hope, settled down upon one; determined to work it up to the proper pitch, and achieve the disastrous work of revolution. And a revolution indeed did they end in: a revolution of demolition—which leaves not one stone upon another that is not thrown down. But all this was no more than was aimed at, and resolved on; for even Hubbard, one of our American historians of Puritanism, fully admits, that the thoroughly "Gifted Brethren" stood "stiffly to maintain a necessity of abrogating and disannulling their former Church-state, and begin all anew; as if things had been so far collapsed in the days of our fathers, that, like a vessel once infected with the contagion of leprosy, it must be broken in pieces to be new-cast and moulded, or else to be judged unclean and unfit for the service of God."*

Most truly these men were not image-breakers but church-breakers: ecclesiastical destructionists of the straitest sect. The Government evidently saw, that they could not treat such persons as they had treated persons like Fox and Humphrey; or as they had treated the peaceable Huguenots, who had escaped from Romish violence.[46] The contest between them and itself was one, which compromise, reform, conciliation, could never settle. It was a war of extermination on one side,† and of self-defence (*pro aris et focis*) on the other. This is the unvarnished picture of the case; and, with reference to it, should we ever scrutinize and estimate the (so called) persecutions of the Gov-

[46] See Note 46.

* Hubbard's New England, p. 118. In the Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series.

† By an ordinance, passed Aug. 23, 1645, the use of the Book of Common Prayer was not only forbidden in public, but in *private*, on penalty of fines and imprisonment for a year! (Blackstone's Comm. iv. 50, 52.) Be the day remembered! See also "Candid Examination," a Reply to Dr. Mayhew, pp. 55, 56.

ernment of England. The severities of that Government were necessary acts of policy.[47] Mr. Neal finds no difficulty, none whatever, in such a doctrine; for he can say, with a safe conscience, that Cromwell's execrable law against the half-starved Episcopal clergy, forbidding them even to keep school, "was made *for the safety of the government*, [Neal's own italics,] against a number of men who were undermining it"—nay, more, "was published chiefly *in terrorem*."[48] * And who then can blame a government, *not usurped*, for being a little solicitous for the same safety; and, moreover, for trying occasionally to scare its enemies? This is no more than good policy can justify, in a downright tyrant; Daniel Neal himself being vindicator. And if further justification be requisite for this good policy, it can be found in the fact, that such policy could be justified progressively; according to the Puritan habit to which I have previously alluded. We find it justified in England theoretically. In New England we find it justified practically. To be sure, even a Unitarian's hatred of the Church of England can call it, by most curious lexicography, "watchfulness or intolerance," and, jealousy without cruelty; but I shall not hesitate to call it, a direct imitation of what the Puritans condemned stoutly in the English Establishment, and as but one among a thousand proofs of the sincerity of their clamors.†

My readers will remember, what nauseous epithets the Puritans applied to the Church at home, and to her time-honored ministers. Now, no doubt, they considered it an audacious crime to retort on such scurrility, (see more of it in Grant's Eng. Ch. ii. 440,) the penalties of a civil tribu-

[47] See Note 47. [48] See Note 48.

* Neal, iv. 160.—Massachusetts, in her acts of tyranny, disavowed even such equivocal humanity as this.—R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 152.

† Bancroft's America, 7th edition, i. 394.

nal. Aye; but see how they themselves can endure such a visitation, from the lips of even a menial. "At this court, one Philip Ratcliff, a servant of Mr. Craddock, being convict *ore tenus*, of most foul, scandalous tenets, against our churches and government, was sentenced to be whipped, fined £40, lose his ears, and be banished the plantation; which was presently executed."* In 1643, Samuel Gorton and others, who did not so much as belong to the colony of Massachusetts, were nevertheless marched up from Rhode Island, at the point of the bayonet. They were tried for their "blasphemous and wicked errors," which probably consisted, in chief, in not allowing the infallibility of a Puritan eldership; for by that eldership they were adjudged guilty of death.† But fortunately, as was often the case, the Puritan laity were more merciful than the ministers. The magistrates shrunk from blood; (at least some of them;) and so Gorton and his colleagues escaped the gallows, and were only condemned to work like convicts, and "wear irons upon one leg," till they could be conveniently banished. So much is Mr. Savage's honest indignation stirred by this infamous proceeding, and especially by "the

* Savage's Winthrop, i. 56, and note. Felt's Salem, p. 54.—This was in 1631, whereas Prynne did not have his ears cut off till 1663; nor Bastwick and Burton theirs, till 1637. (See Rushworth's Collections, ii. 382.) So, in these horrid punishments, the Puritans in New England set Archbishop Laud, in Old England, an example to copy! Surely they ought to be kinder to their imitator!

† "This detestable tyranny came of Mr. Cotton's *Jewish theocracy*, and it is a lamentable fact, that that mistaken divine encouraged the court in this horrid oppression of Gorton and his unfortunate associates." Benedict's Baptists, i. 462. The laity, however, were not very unplastic materials for a clerical inquisitor. "I fear," says Gov. Winthrop's brother, "the Lord is offended for sparing the lives of Gorton and his companions; for if they all be as busy as this at Salem, there will be much evil seed sown in the country. I hope some of them will be brought to trial next court, for breach of their order; and if yet you shall spare them, I shall fear a curse upon the land," Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, i. 16.

horrible judgment of the elders," that he well says in a note, "It must be inferred that no place, *but England*, was left for the unhappy schismatics."*

These are but solitary instances, to illustrate what Puritan policy can do for its own "safety;" though Puritans may be privileged to pronounce such policy in the English Government, as they did in the English Church, a Babylonish abomination. But there are plenty in store where these came from, if it be thought necessary to evoke them. Puritan archives are rich in matter; and the records of the Star-Chamber and High-Commission Courts of Massachusetts are in good preservation. It will be remembered that the powers of these courts were explicitly arrogated.† That they were exercised, as freely as in London, or in the halls of the Inquisition, is a proposition which I would a thousand times sooner address myself to prove, than the desperate one of Mr. Punchard, viz., that Congregationalism "presents the most efficient barriers to the inroads of heresy and false doctrine."‡ Mr. Punchard wisely eschews facts under such a proposition, and spends all his vigor on theory. However, he does as well as he can. The woful and still increasing defections of Congregationalism, leave him nothing else. Its past history, or even its present, (if the charges of Socinians be true, who have departed less from strict Congregationalism than their orthodox brethren,) will supply me with *facts*, till I match every grievance in England with its parallel here.

As I contemplate the tribute which the Puritans would have extorted from the English Government, and the assaults (for they were no less) by which they attempted to enforce it, I often ask myself,—What possibly consistent

* Savage's Winthrop, ii. 142–149. R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 134, 135. Emerson's First Church, p. 78.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, iii. 84.

‡ Punchard's View, &c. p. 176.

argument can be urged, that this Government should have yielded to their demands? Here sits our modern eulogist of his Puritanical ancestry, whose republican doctrine is, that the majority should always be supreme, and, with the ineffable self-complacency of a smoking Turk, marvels that the people of England should have preferred a monarchy and Episcopacy, to the "changes and chances" to which a few levellers would introduce them. And, because they decided that their strength was to sit still, he bespatters them with the epithets, "priest-ridden," and "king-ridden," and a score beside, as pertinent and expressive. Truly, this is an edifying spectacle. It reminds one of the *sequitur* in the sorites of Shylock the Jew.

> "Shall I bend low, and in a bondman's key,
> With 'bated breath and whispering humbleness,
> Say this:—
> Fair Sir, you spit on me on Wednesday last;
> You spurned me such a day; another time
> You called me dog; and for these courtesies
> I'll lend you thus much monies."

A great nation not to manage its own concerns in its own way, but to submit to the dictation of a petty clan, whose best commendation is that themselves think themselves holier, wiser, and worthier?* And because it will not, and arrests, (it may be, not with a nurse's gentleness to a queasy baby,) that "unruly evil," which would sprinkle "deadly poison" on all it values, is it to be viewed with vast surprise, and its acts denounced, not to the third and fourth, (the Divine limit,) but to the thirtieth and fortieth generation, as the quintessence of tyranny? O modesty, truth, and candor! is such a perversion of right and reason one of the illustrations of the doctrine of Total Depravity?

* This is no new question. Similar ones were put to Puritans in the olden time.—L'Estrange's Holy Cheat, ed. 1662. p. 132. Naked Truth, ed. 1675, p. 27.

But does not simple fact authorize me to draw this picture, of the restless demands, the sour aspersions, and the demolishing schemes, of the thorough-bred Puritan? What if Episcopacy, and a hundred other things, were associated with the government of England, which *we*, for example, might not relish? What if Churchmen thought Old England, as the Puritans did New England, the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness?* What if they thought it a "little theocracy," in which not "Eaton and Davenport," but Charles I. and Laud, should be "the Moses and Aaron?"† What would such a condition of affairs be to us, if the people chose to have it so? And did not the people of England choose to have it so? did not *protection* under Cromwell almost grind them to powder? did not the hierarchy of presbyteries, and the "lord brethren," drive the people for relief, into as many sects and schisms as they were ever driven by inquisitorial Rome?‡ And did they not welcome back a legitimate monarch, and *bona fide* bishops, with triumphs of joy? Let the Restoration of 1660 answer.[49]

O it is a famous construction of the rights of private judgment, (one of the fashions of this era of "development,") that a body of men who decree themselves right, may forsooth denounce and overturn the entire fabric of a state, which unfortunately cherishes opinions and practices not harmonizing with their pattern. And it must be said, that, of all places on the terraqueous globe, New England is the most unfit to countenance and abet it. For I know not the people beneath this sun, so zealous for their peculiar

[49] See Note 49.

* Mather's Magnalia, i. 296.

† Bacon's Historical Disc. p. 96.

‡ "Never people nearer to a bottomless pit of horrible evils," says the Presbyterian Baillie, in 1646.—Baillie's Letters, ii. 228.

habits, institutions, and privileges, (right or wrong,) as New Englanders—not the people, who would sooner resent, or repel, any encroachment on their freedom, "as they understand it"—not the people, who would more stoutly, fiercely, unshrinkingly, unfailingly, defend it, (true freedom or false,) to the utmost impulse of strength, and the latest beat of the heart. South Carolina has had her nullification, and New England her Hartford Convention; but having lived in a southern state as well as in a northern one, I am free to say, that if rebellion must come, my most earnest prayer would be, Let it not begin among the posterity of the Puritans. The little finger of rebellion there, would be thicker than the loins of nullification elsewhere.* And this ever makes me think, that the Government of England must have had a struggle of dread anxiety, with those who have transmitted Puritan tempers and principles to our distant times. And yet *(mirabile visu!)* among those who account such tempers and principles their dearest legacy, do we find the heartiest denouncers of the self-defensive severities of England. All this too, by those, who, when England's arm (unlike those of Mahomet's angels) could not reach across a hemisphere, wielded the power of such severities, without one scruple; and prosecuted them with a vehemence so unpausing, and an immutability so dire, that Christian courtesy and charity shrink aghast from the frightful exhibition.

But I may lose too much time on a subject, so full of the seeds of things, that one is tempted to digressions at every step. MY OBJECT IN DEFENCE OF OUR OWN CHURCH IS, TO ADDUCE AND IMPRESS THE SALUTARY AND RIGIDLY JUST IDEA, THAT, OF ALL CENSORS ON THE GLOBE, THE PU-

* So probably would Cotton Mather himself have said; for it is his testimony, "New England has, at the best, been always too faulty in that very character, [of old Egypt,] *a province very talkative, and ingenious for the vilifying of its public servants.*" Life of Phips, pp. 99, 100.

RITANS AND THEIR POSTERITY SHOULD BE THE LAST TO COMPLAIN OF ECCLESIASTICAL PREDOMINANCE AND CIVIL PENALTIES. Charles Butler, Esq., author of the Book of the Roman Catholic Church, once proposed that the cruelties of Queen Mary to the Protestants, should be kept in abeyance, if the cruelties of Queen Elizabeth to the Papists were put under a similar embargo. Much more should Puritans propose never to disparage the Church of England, or vilify the name of Laud, if Churchmen would not recount their own enormities, or blazon those of Endicott, whom a soft-voiced Quaker, the historian Sewel, in the anguish of his soul, cannot refrain from pronouncing "extravagantly severe—barbarously ungrateful—blood-thirsty" —and as having "died with rottenness, his name being like to give a bad savor through ages to come."[50] * I say much more should Puritans propose this, for they were the aggressors. The Church of England was in the field before them: Elizabeth's first Act of Uniformity being made, (as Sewel confesses, p. 263,) against Papists only, and thought quite enough for the long interval of three and twenty years! This Church, then, had the right, the vested right, of possession. It had, what a Puritan taste so much delighted to see confirmed by a charter, "the entire property of the soil." And well therefore might it be said, as Puller said in after days, roused sometimes beyond his text—"Moderation"—"What right can be pretended by these men, to attempt innovations in Church and State? Who made them trustees, or, to speak in their own language, the keepers of the liberties of England?"† Well might it have been asked them, how they durst contemn the too gentle rebuke of Bullinger, that no man should frame a conscience

[50] See Note 50.

* Sewel's Quakers, 160, 339, 343.

† Puller, chap. xiii. p. 238, new edition.

for himself, out of the spirit of contentiousness.* But these self-satisfied advocates of liberty and equality, were nothing daunted by such considerations. On all occasions, when they might be gainers and not losers, they obtrusively enter the scene, and say to England's Church and State, Your peculiarities ought not so to be.[51] We ought to share your freehold; our pleasure ought to be consulted in your management; and if our wishes are not regarded, we warn you in the language of Pharaoh to Moses, "Look to it, for evil is before you." And because their presumption does not bend, nor their threats intimidate—and because, when they do not, and even force and cunning fail, (cunning to which, as a Presbyterian said, Machiavel and the Jesuits were but punies and freshmen,)† they abandon England in vexation, to play their favorite game on a more open theatre—Oh, they are persecuted by those "caterpillars of the world, who consume yearly twenty-five hundred or three thousand pounds," and fly in pious horror from their father-land for "*a purely religious cause!*"

This brings us to a new point in our devious subject, the self-exile, (expatriation, says a Presbyterian,‡) of the Puritans from Europe; which has been ascribed, without flinching, to the cause just specified. Says John Norton, in 1659, with a dogmatism inherent in his race, "It concerneth New England always to remember, that originally they are a plantation *religious*, not a plantation of trade."[52] Increase Mather hath it thus: it was "with regard to church-order and discipline, that the good old Puritan nonconformists *transported* themselves, and their families, over the vast ocean, to these goings down of the sun." Says

[51] See Note 51. [52] See Note 52.

* Le Bas's Jewel, p. 169, English edition.

† Edwards's Gangraena, Pt. iii. 150.

‡ Hetherington's West. Ass. p. 159.

Judge Story, "The Puritans, persecuted at home, and groaning under the weight of spiritual bondage, cast a longing eye toward America, as an ultimate retreat for themselves and their children. They were encouraged by the information, that the colonies at Plymouth were allowed to worship their Creator according to the dictates of their consciences, *without* molestation."* Says a Unitarian minister, Mr. Francis, "The enterprise was strictly speaking an ecclesiastical concern; and presents the singularly striking case of a nation receiving its existence, distinctly and wholly, from religious causes."† And lastly, says even a Baptist, "The Puritans, a title of intellectual as well as moral nobility, left all the endearments of home for a purely religious cause."‡ He says this, however, as do many, from having by its perennial repetition acquiesced, unthinkingly, in the sing-song of the day; for, in most illogical and infelicitous juxtaposition, we find on his very next page a hint, that even down to A. D. 1765, his Baptist brethren were "almost every where oppressed," by those on whom he had just bestowed the broadest letters patent, which ever graced an aristocrat.§ However, be this incongruity as it may, the representation which depicts the Puritans as having "transported" (unlucky phrase!) themselves for a purely religious cause, is one which, with New England sturdiness, I must positively deny, and continue to deny, till I can read history backwards. And in doing so, I resort not to the pitiable disclaimer of Unitarians, and say that I am alone in this adventure. My fellow-churchmen, I am equally positive, will give me many a hearty *Amen*. "Strive for the truth unto death, and the LORD shall fight for thee," says an authority, which if apocryphal, (Ecclus. iv. 28,) has all but

* Comm. on the Const. i. 46. † Hist. of Watertown.

‡ Wayland's Sermon on Dependence of Science on Religion, p. 20.

§ Compare Benedict's History of the Baptists, i. 381.

the warrant of inspiration. It speaks its sense, if not its words; and I can act on it with uplifting confidence in my brethren and my cause.

And now for the reasons, which sustain your correspondent in his position. Pray have we not had a glimpse of them already? Has not something been detailed, to justify "good old" Owen Felltham's definition of a Puritan: "As he is more generally in these times taken to be, I suppose we may call him a Church-rebel; or one that would exclude order, that his brain might rule?"* at least something to warrant the less questionable definition of the gentle Cowper, in one of his letters (p. 65); "Every circumstance of ecclesiastical order and discipline was an abomination to them?" From the very fact, that the through and through Puritans were determined to have nothing short of absolute ascendency in Church and State—had virtually adopted the watchword of an ambition as tall as their own—*Aut Cæsar, aut nullus*—is not the inference gained, without their own circumvolution, that they deserted England because this ascendency was beyond their reach? True, they conjured up a storm, and went away in the midst of it. During this storm, blows were given as well as taken; and the issue was not *then* to be, that Church and State should be sundered and thrown prostrate in the desperate strife. The Puritans were at first vanquished, and compelled to tap the drum for a retreat. Reluctantly enough, perhaps; for if they or theirs ever had one characteristic, which like Aaron's rod swallowed up all its associates, it was the disposition to have every thing after "the devices and desires of their own hearts." They were compelled to retreat. Yes, and they sailed for Holland, and strove to plant a lever there, for overturning institutions not congenial to their whims. But,

* Felltham's Resolves, edit. 1820, p. 9. Felltham was born about 1600, and died about 1678.

by mishap, there was no stand-point, no *που στω* for them. "There they were tolerated indeed, but watched," says the philosophical and impartial author of 'European Settlements,' whose work has been already quoted; and so "they chose to remove to a place where they should see no superior."* Eleven "long tedious years" were quite enough, to make them devoutly "tired of the indolent security of their sanctuary." Restraining grace was not one of the largest endowments of the "Gifted Brethren." Their smothered ambition at last breaks out; and we find them pushing for a theatre where they might be free from "watching," and wield "the rod of empire" with none to make afraid. But, after all, they were too wary to be content with a skeleton frame of government, not clothed upon with wholesome muscle—unbraced with nerve and sinew. Duly cautious therefore were they, to look not only after power, but after the only vital aliment of power; that TRASH, which, saith the poet's paradox, is something—nothing. They never braved a billow, till they had attempted to drive a favorable bargain with a company of merchants, who had more capital but as much sharpness as themselves, and who therefore bound them in ten tight articles.† They and their emissaries went to and fro, like the raven upon the waters, till they obtained under sign and seal a Charter, whose munificent compass and unqualified endowments rivalled in *their* construction of it, the powers of Parliament, and every court within the realm.‡

And being such, and attempting such things in England, and failing *there*—failing too in their fond schemes in Holland—then compacting with an avowed band of money-getters, and fortified by this all-embracing charter, they set up their standard on this distant shore:—And all for "a

* Vol. ii. 137, 138. † Baylies' Plymouth, i. 18, 19.
‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, iii. 84.

purely religious cause"? They look after the profits of trade, with eagle eyes; for the tell-tale letter of Dudley reveals their expectations:*—And all for "a purely religious cause"? They "profess freely," that they come here to "win and incite the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind and the Christian faith;" (see the Charter;) and yet "have nothing to excuse themselves in this point, of not laboring with the Indians to instruct them, but their want of a staple trade, and other business taking them up:"†—And all this for "a purely religious cause"? They give up these poor natives, (to whom the Charter should have been like the great sheet let down from heaven, full of many a year's provision,) as victims to rum and gunpowder, because esteemed agents and familiars of the devil; they sell their children into West Indian slavery;‡ they suspect them most, when best intentioned, if they dare to pity a banished heretic, and make them liable to exterminating war:§ And all this for "a purely religious cause"? They rule, (as we shall soon see,) with a superstition, and under the promptings of a priestcraft, unsurpassed in the annals of Popes or of Lauds, of High-Commissions or Star-Chambers:—And all this for "a purely religious cause"? They arrest, (as we shall also soon see,) try, condemn, fine, imprison, fetter, brand, lash, maim, curse, banish, hang, and leave naked and unburied (save in the bowels of beasts of

* See also James Shirley's confession, about their aiming at *other* ends than God's glory.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, iii. 49.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, iii. 80.

‡ Trumbull's Connecticut, i. 115. Stone's Brant, pref. i. p. xv.—Even royal blood was no more spared here than in England. A son of King Philip, a mere child, was sold into slavery. The ministers, however, like genuine Dominican friars, were for putting him to death, and pleaded Scripture as usual.—(Knowles's Memoir, 347.)

§ R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 155.

prey) their brethren in a common Protestant Christianity :—And all this for "a purely religious cause"? They re-enact what Bancroft calls, "*The worst statute in the English code*, that which did but enforce attendance upon the parish church;"* and drag those whom they had made heretics by vote, and with the force of military as well as civil power, to hear teachers whom they had constituted orthodox by vote :†—And all this for "a purely religious cause"? They establish the principle, which Bogue and Bennett say "carries in it all the vilest leaven of an exclusive establishment,"‡ allowing *no one* the rights of a freeman, "not admitted of their Church :"[53] moreover another equally odious principle, allowing *no one* to be tried or judged, "be it for life or limb, name or estate," but "by those of the Church," who, Hutchinson§ admits, are "in a sort *their* adversaries," that happen not to be of the elect fraternity :—And all this for "a purely religious cause"? They tolerate such grossness in the pulpit, and in the press, (and against those whose sex should have been sufficient protection,) as might disgrace a bar-room :—And all this for "a purely religious cause?"||

Yes; there is a nomenclature in which things like these may be—not written down or cloaked over, beneath "balloon or inflated sleeves"—but written down and mollified, if not justified, by the stolen and insulted sanction of "pure religion." There is such a nomenclature in which, notwithstanding, the fines and forfeitures and imprisonments and

[53] See Note 53.

* America, i. 369. † Savage's Wint. ii. 142, 238, notes.
‡ Dissenters, ii. 440. § Hist. Mass. i. 31.
|| Savage's Wint. i. 271, &c. Mather's Mag. ii. 449.—And all this, too, when, as Hubbard confesses, they had a fairer opportunity to hit the right mark, "than ever men had in many ages past."—Hubbard's New England, p. 181.

scourges of Abp. Laud, would be written with "a pen of iron," as offences never to be forgiven or forgotten. Be it thus, if men will try to rivet prejudices till they become like laws—like the laws of the Medes and Persians, which never changed. Who would not rather be such as Laud, though he had less of prudence and judgment, than of zeal and honesty, than such as these?[54] I well know that any advocacy of this ill-omened name, how slight soever, will be atrocious guilt before that livid implacability, which will never admit that its offences against man, have to man been deeply atoned for, by a trial to which the rack were a mercy, by a doom to the gallows, and by death (earth's latest boon to him) under the executioner's axe.[55] But I feel as if it were any thing but sin to defend him, (noble defender as he was of the Protestant faith in his conference with the Jesuit Fisher,)[56] when, even at this late day, I discover a very positive assertor declaring,* that but for the Puritans England had never been Protestant. Venerable, but alas, Episcopal Lambeth! the blood of two of your archbishops, martyred by Romanists and by Puritans, proclaims who were your worst enemies, and how earnestly you have contended for the faith once delivered to the saints, by "the armor of righteousness ON THE RIGHT HAND AND ON THE LEFT."

[54] See Note 54. [55] See Note 55. [56] See Note 56.

* Bancroft, i. 289.—Let Mr. Bancroft here remember his forgotten episode on Virginia, and her universal suffrage. I shall speak of the matter in due time.

LETTER V.

HAVING now gone over, as my limits allow me, the prominent points of English Puritan history, it is but equitable that we should listen to some of the apologies which have been offered in its behalf; and also to the reasons assigned for the resolution to erect the standard of Puritanism in New England. This letter will, accordingly, be devoted to an examination of the principal of these apologies and reasons.

I.—The first I would call attention to, is the nature of the contest for which the Puritans were enlisted.

"The nature of the contest in which they were so deeply concerned, was adapted," says Mr. Francis, "to bring out the sharp, stern, uncompromising qualities of the human character.[57] * Such opinions, says Mr. Bancroft, as "the advocating liberty of conscience," and "enmity to colonial independence," opinions entertained by Gorton and his associates, "would have destroyed the ecclesiastical system of Massachusetts, and subverted its liberties."† In other words, the Puritans *took it upon themselves* to decide, that such opinions, in the too free-minded Gorton and his colleagues, were highly dangerous; though they lived in Rhode Island, and were without the narrow precincts of the Massachusetts charter.[58] They were opinions, like Roger Wil-

[57] See Note 57. [58] See Note 58.

* Hist. Watertown, p. 4. † America, i. 419.

liams's, amenable to the penalties of Master Cotton's statute of lese-majesty.* They would issue in TREASON; and therefore it was lawful for Puritans to despatch an armed force, and march the unfortunate liberalists before the musket's muzzle, within the territory of Massachusetts—try them there—all but hang them, and then doom them to toil like bond slaves, wear the iron garters of felons, and not dare to open their lips, except to a magistrate, or a minister, on pain of immediate death! †

So, then, "the nature of the contest" is one excuse for what the Hon. Mr. Savage says he can call by "no milder word" than "extraordinary tyranny;"‡ and their own belief that their ecclesiastical sovereignty and colonial independence were in peril, is another. I will not pause to illustrate, as might be done on the authority of the Papist Fleury,§ how political and not conscientious reasons influence such decisions. For argument's sake, let the premises stand; and then let us ask if they could not serve our turn quite as well. I wish we may never be called to answer a darker question: better *data* no one need desire.

It is well known, that if Roger Williams was not an abolitionist respecting slavery, he was respecting all test acts, statutes against heresy, and against free toleration. He wrote with all his might in opposition to the "Bloody Tenet of Persecution," and published his book in London, A. D. 1644. In A. D. 1647, that book received an answer from a Puritan minister, John Cotton. The presumptuous, not to say profane title of this answer was, "The Bloody Tenet washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb." Cotton labored with a zest which would have made Dunstan or Dominic smile: another coincidence, by the way,

* Bancroft's America, i. 374.

† Compare Holmes's Annuals, i. 272.—Knowles's Roger Williams, 184–189.

‡ Winthrop, i. 289.

§ Disc. on Eccl. Hist. p. 265.

between Papists and Puritans; for a more earnest defence of persecution cannot be found upon all the shelves of the Vatican. Charles IX. should have had it to read, the night preceding the massacre of St. Bartholomew: it would have been equal to an absolution beforehand.* But I may be thought to be too harsh a critic, though upon a principle than which popery has not a harsher; so I will quote the commentary of the Baptist Prof. Knowles. "The Court of High Commission, who expelled Mr. Cotton from England, would have needed no other defence of their conduct than his own arguments."† And, with equal propriety and truth, may we say of the authorities of England who expelled the Puritans, (if, that is, they were not rather expatriated,) they needed no other defence of their conduct than Puritan ratiocination. Be it ever remembered—let it have *monumentum ære perennius*—that Puritans have argued and vindicated persecution upon principle! They have written solemnly in its behalf. Nay, they have consecrated it among the standards of their religion. Cotton knew he was not alone;‡ and accordingly we find, at the very close of the Cambridge and Saybrook Platform, where the spirit of the instrument seems to have been condensed and levelled, this tremendous sanction of civil penalties for offences against an established religion. "If any church, one or more, shall grow schismatical, rending itself from the communion of other churches, or shall walk incorrigibly or obstinately in any corrupt way of their own, contrary to the rule of the word, in such case the magistrate is to put forth his coercive power, as the matter shall require."§

* He needed it sadly. See Gifford's France, iii. 277.

† Memoir of Roger Williams, p. 199.

‡ Cotton's sentiments were fully sustained by the Puritans at home. The celebrated "Pym asserted, that it was the duty of the legislature to establish true religion, and to punish false." (British critic, xv. 74.)

§ Camb. and Sayb. Plat. p. 67. Boston, 1829.

As the matter shall require! O would Torquemada himself, that demon of the Inquisition, have asked for a broader license? Yet that is not the worst of it. The Synod who published this plenary indulgence to the bitterest civil persecutor, "went on comfortably," as we are told (p. 6); and, as we are further told (p. 11), when they "had finished the Platform of Church Discipline, they did, with an extraordinary elevation of soul and voice, then sing together the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb."* Now, under the principle whose praises they thus chanted, with their souls' whole strength, Christians, (erring ones, if you please, but professing and calling themselves Christians,) were imprisoned, fined, mangled, banished, and slain.† And if there be much to choose between this Puritan pæan and the Te Deum of the Pope and his cardinals after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, I have not the sagacity to discover it. Nor is this all which I have to say, and which historical fidelity requires of me. Puritanism, like Popery, never changes, at least in temper. The sanction here given to any and to all persecution "as the matter shall require," the editor of the volume before me is constrained to acknowledge has never been repealed. The Platform, he says on p. 12, "never has been superseded, or finally annulled." So Rome has never superseded or formally annulled her right to impose an interdict, or burn a heretic. But Protestant Episcopacy has done so. She has blotted from her statute-book, for near two hundred years, this impious, God-defying prerogative. Puritanism and Popery, for all that their authentic standards can say to the contrary, may still pursue a hapless dissenter from their infallible dictation, "as the matter shall require."

* In the Plymouth laws, p. 105, new edition, Scripture is quoted as a sanction to all their laws—persecuting ones and all.

† The principle ended in bloodshedding, just as Roger Williams foretold to Endicott that it would. (Knowles's Memoir, p. 374.)

II.—A second and favorite argument with multitudes is, that the Puritans would never have been persecutors, had they not learned ferocious lessons from their contemporaries.

In other words, bad example is an available apology for crime. Now it is not very marvellous to find a mere political writer, contemplating such an argument with no peculiar aversion; for he knows his own side wants it as much as that of his adversaries. Sir J. Mackintosh, therefore, can say without a qualm, that "the excesses of the continental Catholics, which were generally followed by hostility against their brethren, sometimes led to measures of rigor against the ultra-reformers, [no small concession, by the way, for a Whig to call a Puritan an ultra,] in order to check the scandal of Protestant dissension."* And again, he can say, on the same page, that Queen Elizabeth "believed, *like all her contemporaries*, that the formation of new bodies in the Church, without her permission, was as flagrant rebellion as the establishment of courts and officers of justice, unauthorized by her, would be." But this is too worldly an argument for even Mr. Neal to stand sponsor, I should say "pro-parent," for. At the beginning of his fourth volume, therefore, knowing how others had employed it, and would expect him to use it after them, to justify Puritanism in its prime, (remembering, too, no doubt, Dr. Watts's unworthy admonition to mollify,) he is obliged to repudiate it. "And though the vigorous proceedings of the puritans of this age did by no means rival those of the prelates, before and after the civil wars, yet they are so many species of persecution, and *not to be justified, even by the confusion of the times in which they were acted.*"† Perhaps, however, Neal had before his eye the pungent query of Chandler, which appeared only the year previous to the

* Mack. England, American edit. p. 374. † Neal, iv. pref. p. vi.

publication of this preface.* "And who could have imagined, but that their own sufferings for conscience' sake must have excited in them an utter abhorrence of these Antichristian principles, by which they themselves had so deeply smarted ?† Or, possibly, he might have read a little in the Independent Whig, which was published while he was writing about New England and the Puritans. In one of its volumes, that virulent anti-episcopal journal chastises even the Puritans, thus:—"To oppose them was to oppose God; though *their* ways were far from resembling *his* ways. They particularly persecuted others, as bitterly as if they themselves had never suffered the bitterness of persecution."‡ Such things, it is not improbable, made Mr. Neal somewhat wary, as in that fourth volume he was approaching the period when Puritanism was to display its full-blown vigor.

But the ardor of apologists on this side of the water overleaps such considerations as made Mr. Neal a little timid. Dr. Hawes can say, promptly, "The fault of our fathers was the fault of the age.§ Mr. Quincy says, that they who are disposed to condemn them do not realize "the prevailing character of the times."|| While Dr. Bacon, with a tact and taste peculiarly his own, tries to turn the tables

* Chandler's book came out in A. D. 1736. Neal's preface to vol. iv. of his Puritans, dates 1737.

† Chandler on Persecution, p. 396.

‡ Ind. Whig, iv. 280.

§ Tribute to the Pilgrims, 2d edit. p. 115.—"The spirit of the age," says a Puritan apologist, "inflamed the best men to bigotry."—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, i. 1. This is just as good an excuse for Laud as for them.

|| Centennial Address, p. 26.—Mr. Upham says, (Life of Vane, p. 147,) that the Puritans "were faithful to the cause *as they understood it*"—his own italics. And so was Archbishop Laud faithful to the cause, *as he understood it.* Laud, therefore, was just as faithful as the Puritans, on the showing of their own advocate.

on a modern accuser, by saying that "The little finger of a Lynch committee is thicker than the loins of a Puritan magistracy."* I am duly obliged to Mr. B. for his sanction to such an argument; for it is precisely my own—I am all along saying to such as he is, when they talk of Episcopal tyranny, "Look first at the tender mercies of Puritanism, and then come and judge."

But to my more immediate purpose. Be it that the fault of the age gone by, or the prevailing character of the times, or the faults of this age, extenuate (for that word Dr. Hawes positively insists on) Puritan persecutions. If a persecuting model may thus be copied, or pleaded as ample palliation—Query? May not the Church of England refer her accusers to the persecutions of the Church of Rome; and the Church of Rome hers, to the persecutions of the Pagans; and the Pagans theirs, to their persecutions of one another? for Atheism has done as much to fill the pages of the annals of cruelty, as any system of faith, or philosophy, or medicine, or politics, which has ever pestered the world.† Suppose Laud himself to have been banished to Boston, Massachusetts, according to the purpose of Hugh Peters, and to have been summoned before that Court which punished John Checkley with such severity—what a capital defence might he have made, if he had only had Cotton's book on the "Bloody Tenet," and the records of Endicott's administration, doubled down in dogs' ears, and ready for the contest! Verily, I doubt if even that court could have rebuked him as sternly as they did the luckless editor of Leslie on Episcopacy; for their own eloquence and their own facts would have struck them dumb.

The fault of the age, or the character of the times, sufficient to excuse a persecutor? Possibly it might be to ex-

* Address to the New England Society, p. 33.

† Harris's Charles I. 232, 233.

cuse a persecutor in the Church of Rome, two hundred years since, or a persecutor in the Church of England; for they, as Puritans complained, were beclouded with Egyptian darkness, and knew no better. But themselves belonged to Goshen, they were children of the light; they did know better. They professed to understand and argue the subject of religious toleration. They had made it their hobby for years. And they not tolerate? they do as those whome they upbraided have all along done? they repudiate Laud's principles, but adopt Laud's practice? Ah, if Laud could have preached a sermon to them from the text, "Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege," he might have made every sinner among them cry out with the Philippian jailer, "What must I do to be saved?"*

III.—A third favorite argument in justification of the Puritans is, that the Church of England was essentially Papistical, ("only half-reformed," as Mr. Mitchell says;)† and they were compelled to act as they did, to put new life into that church, which Mr. Bacon calls, so graphically, a mouldering mausoleum of the once glorious, but then dead or decaying Reformation.[59] ‡

[59] See Note 59.

---

* By the decision of Mr. Hallam, whom the Quarterly Review blames for too great *general* advocacy of the Puritans, such conduct is most particularly and thoroughly condemned, as worse than that of an officer of the Inquisition itself.—"In men hardly escaped from a similar peril, in men who had nothing to plead but the right of private judgment, in men who had defied the proscriptive authority of past ages and of established power, the crime of persecution assumes a far deeper hue, and is capable of far less extenuation, than in a Roman inquisitor."—Hallam's Constit. Hist. i. 132. Let this be distinctly remembered. The Puritans professed to be infinitely superior to the church they had abandoned: let us hold them to their professions. Mr. Hallam, their defender, being authority, they have *no* excuse, while the Pope may possibly have *some*.

† Practical Church Member, p. 22. ‡ Bacon's Manual, p. 9.

It is amusing to see how much stomachic relief it affords such writers, as have just been quoted, to enjoy a fling at Episcopacy; and I cannot but stop a moment to say, that honest old-fashioned Presbyterians were far more kindly tempered. Thus, Symson, (a man whom one of the Mathers calls "learned and very holy"—Mather on Prayer, p. 16,) in his history of the Church, published in 1634, does not hesitate to say of that Queen, whom Puritan writers often stigmatize as a secret Papist, that she was "the strongest bulwark of the reformed religion."*

But Puritan writers have no such candor. And if in any thing the Church of England has received unmixed hard measure from them, it is in this, that they insist upon it her Protestantism was a sheer pretension.[60] For while suffering in this way at their hands, at the Pope's she was suffering just as heavily, for her sympathies with Puritanical heretics. The Pope wrote thus to his nuncio at the court of Charles I.: "Advise the clergy to desist from that foolish, nay rather illiterate and childish custom, of distinguishing between the Protestant [Episcopal] and Puritan doctrine."†

Could any situation be more trying or critical, than that of the English Church, between two such extremes, both equally and direfully inimical?‡ There she was on an isthmus, between the two gulfs, Puritanism and Popery, ready to swallow her up alive, and either of them willing to drown her in "a bottomless pit." What should she do?

[60] See Note 60.

* Symson's Ch. Hist. 3d edition, p. 240. Compare Beza's sonnet on her. Phenix Britannicus, p. 452.

† British Critic, xv. 70.—Bergier, in his Romish Theological Dictionary, obeys the Pope, and mixes Puritans and Episcopalians under one title.

‡ Laud's Troubles, p. 163.

how could she possibly escape slander? If she treated the Puritan with severity, that was instantly attributed to her secret "Papistry." If the Papist, with the same severity, that was called a *ruse de guerre* to avoid censure, or disguise her attachment to a Church which they said was no Church at all.[61]*

Now the fact is, that the laws of England were far *more severe* against the Papists than against the Puritans; and if they were not severe in the letter only, but severely inflicted, the sufferers may thank the Puritans for all their pangs. They provoked the Government to deeds of harshness. The execution of Mary of Scotland has often been called the darkest blot on the history of Elizabeth's reign; yet, says Short, "no persons were more strenuous than the Puritans in their endeavors to bring the Queen of Scots to the scaffold."† The unfortunate Charles I. was driven to maltreatment of Papists to save a tottering throne. "Persecution of Roman Catholics was popular in England, and rendered in some degree obligatory on the King."‡ Nevertheless, who, among all the sovereigns of England, have suffered more under Puritan denunciation for covert "Papistry," than Elizabeth Tudor and Charles Stuart?

And still shall it be assumed that the Government of England, under such persons, was virtually Papistical? Why, as an author often quoted shows, it was the unnecessary and uncalled-for severity of that Government, provoked and goaded on by Puritan clamors, which compelled Romanists to fly from England, for the same shelter which Puritans declare they themselves sought in this western hemisphere.§ Lord Baltimore and his associates fled from a

[61] See Note 61.

* Savage's Winthrop, i. 58, 59. † Short's Hist. Eng. Ch. i. 443.

‡ British Critic. xv. 75.

§ Bozman confirms this. He says distinctly of the Puritans; "By

virtual Puritan persecution to the shores of Maryland.* And if he obtained, as he did, a comfortable shelter there—gave Popery a foothold in these United States it might hardly have gained to this passing hour, and laid the foundation of an ascendency it certainly would never have attained to, Papists may thank the Puritans for these inestimable favors.[62] When, then, Puritan editors, pamphleteerers, and lecturers, declaim against Popery's giant strides here, let them remember who first virtually planted it. Protestant Episcopacy, if suffered to pursue the even tenor of her way, would long have kept it in abeyance, and erected here, as elsewhere, "the strongest bulwarks" against an unreformed religion. But Protestant Episcopacy is the object of Puritanism's longest hate. Like Juno's jealousy of Troy, it pursues her even in her low estate: "*necdum antiquum saturata dolorem.*"† It would not allow her a bishop here to the latest possible period: see that precious pamphlet, "Minutes of the Convention of Delegates from the Synod of New-York and Philadelphia, and from the Associations of Connecticut, held annually from 1766 to 1775 inclusive," and which leaked out of the press at the safe and distant date of 1843.‡ But Puritanism sent Popery here, in 1632: let the disastrous instrumentality be "graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever!"

IV.—A fourth argument in justification of Puritanism is, that if it did not manifest as due a love of charity as might

[62] See Note 62.

---

their clamors for a vigorous execution of the laws against Papists, it now became necessary for them also to look about for a place of refuge." Maryland, pp. 230, 231.

* European Sett. ii. 220, 221. Chalmers's Revolt of the Colonies, i. 62. Eddis's Letters, pp. 40, 41. Hewatt's South Carolina, i. 36.

† Æneid, v. 608.

‡ And all this in spite of Dr. Chandler's full explanations in 1767. See Chandler's Appeal, chaps. ix. x. xi.

possibly have been expected, and did not make the immediate conversion of the Indians its "main, principal, and only end," after its "free profession" and the "royal intention" of its charters, it did nevertheless manifest a most astonishing and zealous love of learning, as soon as it had effected a lodgment on these far-off shores.[63]

Indeed! But this is a tack on which a Churchman might hardly expect to have been taken, who remembered what South appositely calls, Harry Vane's "villainous and monstrous advice." Vane saw, what others could easily see, if not bat-blind, how learning and its adjuncts were pillars and stays to the Episcopal cause. So he wanted "learning discountenanced, and the universities threatened, their revenues to be sold, their colleges to be demolished, the law to be reformed after the same model, the records of the nation to be burnt."* Or, if South be distrusted as a priest, (though he quotes every word which I have quoted,) let us see what so calm a lay observer as my Lord Bacon testifies, and who was an eye-witness of Puritanical demonstrations and tendencies at an earlier day. "For while," he says, "they inveigh against a dumb ministry, they make too easy and too promiscuous an allowance of such as they account preachers, having not respect enough to their learnings in other arts, which are handmaids to divinity, [this corroborates clearly Vane's hit at the universities;] not respect enough to years, except it be in case of extraordinary gift; not respect enough to the gift itself, which many times is none at all. For, God forbid that every man that can take unto himself boldness to speak an hour together

[63] See Note 63.

* South's Sermons, iii. 441.—Compare Wood's Ath. Oxon, ii. 561, 562. Biographie Universelle, 41, 503, a. Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, vi. 254. Allen's Dict. 646. Baillie's quotation from Barrow's Discovery. Dissuasive, p. 50.

in a church upon a text, should be admitted for a preacher, though he mean never so well."* This is as cool a description, and yet as thorough a picture of the subject, as one of my lord's decisions in the Court of Chancery. But, after all, South cannot be far from right in every thing he says of Puritan depreciation of learning; for one of his caustic retorts has nailed the matter to the counter. "Granted," said he, "that God has no need of human learning. But if he has not, still less has he need of human ignorance." Language like this is as memorable as a national proverb, and equally illustrative of the times which engendered it.[64]

But "circumstances alter cases," we are informed: the Puritans did not decry universities, or "the arts which are handmaids to divinity," on this side of the water. O no, by no means. So soon as they are fixed where *themselves* are uppermost, and a little of this world's lore will enrich and dignify, they take steps for amassing it with all wariness and speed. Schools and colleges are valuable enough, when they can be levers to uplift *their* fame and fortunes; and not twenty years pass over their heads, before they lay the foundations of the first university in the country. The Puritans landed in 1620, and Harvard University was founded in 1638. But though Puritans had denounced, as Dissenters do still denounce, the close connexion between the English universities and the English Church, on what principles was their own first seminary of learning established? It was dedicated to Christ and the Church: *Christo et Ecclesiæ* was the very motto of its seal, and remains such to the present day. Alas! if they who first gloried in that device, could now walk the halls of Cambridge, and the streets of Boston, how, from their inmost hearts, would burst the anticipated classic lamentation, "*Fuimus Troës,*

[64] See Note 64.

* Montagu's Bacon, vii. 85.

fuit Ilium; sed jam seges est ubi Troja fuit. Fuit Anglia, fuit Nov-Anglia, fuit Bostonia Europæa Americana."*

And, now, does it require a Caledonian second sight, to see through the changes of this shifting scene? Cannot a very tolerable common sense understand that the patrons of the English universities were Churchmen, and that demagogues, who would undermine and prostrate the ancient government, must do so by flattering a class far, far below them? What made Dick the butcher actually say, in Cade's time, "The first thing we do let's kill all the lawyers?" and Mr. Orestes Brownson, in his address to the laboring classes in 1840, virtually say, "The first thing we do let's kill all the priests?" Why, the institutions of the Law and of the Gospel stand in the way of radicals; and, of course, the first step towards the destruction of those institutions is to set their representatives aside. Then the way to spoil is unobstructed. But let the spoil be gained, and let it be ascertained that Law and Gospel will *de facto*, if not *de jure*, help them to hold fast their ill-sought gains; and forthwith the destructives of yesterday become the conservatives of to-day. Dr. Azel Backus, in a Puritan election sermon in 1798, compared the then threatening democrats to that pre-born Jesuit, Absalom; and put into their mouths, as a very text, Absalom's beguiling sigh, "O that I were made judge in the land, that every man, which hath any suit or cause might come unto me, and I would do him justice!" He and his friends thought that they were little better than conspirators, and dreaded their ascendency as a death-blow to the Constitution. That ascendency, however, was soon attained, and has ever since been preserved. And what is the result? Why, under it, one of the most care-

* See Hutchinson's Collection, p. 249.—Also, Chauncey's Seasonable Thoughts, p. 372; where Increase Mather prophetically says, "I am verily afraid that, in process of time, New England will be the wofullest place in all America."

fully-framed conservative powers of the Government, the veto, has been used so freely that it has again and again been said, the veto is too monarchical and must be abolished.

Now all such illustrations as these can be covered by the vicissitudes of Puritan history. In England, in the days of its infancy, Puritanism was opposed to Universities,* to an Establishment, to the concentration of power in rulers. In America, in its manhood, it has been the stanch advocate of all the three.[65] In respect to the last point, though it once gloried in its liberalism, and in its devotion to popular freedom, it is nevertheless believed, that the old political fear that our government is not strong enough, has never abounded more than in Connecticut and Massachusetts; and that there it still lurks, in more secret places than the Union besides contains.†

It is no consolation to be thought inflexibly destitute of charity. I do not make these statements as a politician, for I am not one; (Tros, Tyriusque, mihi, nullo discrimine agetur;) but as attempting something of the province of an historian, in defence of the Church it is my privilege to belong to. Yet I do love light, and so well, as to prize it, even if it give forth, as it comes, a portion of inherent caloric. Those who can show any consideration of my motives must therefore excuse me for saying, that when I find what the Puritans were in England—how languid their zeal there for University wisdom—and when I find that they were never—among all their faults, (though called in Naebe's Ecc. Hist. p. 534, *sceleratissimi, et nequissimi,*) I never knew *this* charged to them—never ignorant of their best

[65] See Note 65.

* Higginson described them as sinks of corruption.—Hutchinson's Coll. p. 27.

† See Fisher Ames's Works, p. 518.

worldly interest, or inattentive to it:—and further, when I know that the monopoly of a people's education is a prize, after which the gentlemen to whom I have supposed Absalom a great grandfather, eagerly aim—and then when I see the Puritans change their *conduct*, but not their *policy*, and strive lustily to fill the minds of youth with "orthodox" knowledge,*—I confess myself unprepared to worship them as most *disinterested* lovers of learning,† and unable to pronounce the praises chanted over them, as such, minstrelsy of surpassing *concord.*

But says Mr. Bacon, in his favorite *ad captandum* way of demolishing objections he cannot argue down, 'You are egregiously in error. Lightfoot was a Puritan, Owen was a Puritan, Selden was a Puritan, Bunyan was a *quasi* one, and John Milton, *instar omnium*, was a genuine one; and your talk about Puritan opposition to learning is but empty words.'‡

So Fenelon was a Roman Catholic, and Bossuet was another, and Bourdaloue, says Bp. Warburton, though a member of the worst society§ and the worst Church on earth, produced the best sermons which ever were written; and therefore, Mr. B., when you dare to lisp another syllable about the Romish Church, as a mother of abominations, remember well your own position on the 22d of December, 1838. O this appeal to names, though taking no doubt with multitudes, and far easier and more sonorous than solid logic, is a wretched way of settling the merits of thousands, who claim their glory, or suffer by their dishonor. It is the infidel's way of determining the merits of religion. Look at Abraham, he says, prevaricating; at David, polluted

* Ancient Charters, &c. pp. 74, 197.

† The learning they *did* have, Baillie, the Presbyterian says, was all gotten "before they entered into their new way." Dissuasive, p. 129.

‡ Address to the New England Soc. pp. 26–29.

§ He was a Jesuit.

by adultery; at James and John, imprecating fire from heaven—nay look at professing Christians now—and talk no more to me of the honesty or purity or charity, of those who arrogate a holy name.[66] But Mr. Bacon sees not that he is wielding a two-edged sword, which can be turned against himself. And, moreover, he does not wield the sword he does brandish, with over-much dexterity. Be it that Lightfoot was once a Puritan. We have a fair reason, if he were not a hypocrite in his new faith, for saying he was quite sick of his old one; for he afterwards conformed to the Established Church.[67] Be it that Owen was one. He was once a sturdy Presbyterian; but was converted to Independency by reading Master Cotton's book on "the power of the keys:"* Master Cotton, be it duly recollected, believing fully in the power of the keys, as well as in the "Bloody Tenet," when he sat unmolested beneath the shadow of the Puritanic fig-tree.[68] And if Owen was converted by him, he took the change very condescendingly; for it made him, what his Presbyterianism never would have made him, vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford. Cromwell put him there, because he had become a supple auxiliary, as an Independent. Had he continued what he once was, that selfish usurper might have said over him, as over a friend less accommodating, "Sir Harry Vane! Sir Harry Vane! Good Lord deliver me from Sir Harry Vane!"†

As to Selden, he was an Erastian—a man who believed in no church government at all:—does that prove he was a Puritan? Nevertheless, says his biographer, Dr. Wilkins, "though he had great latitude in his principles, with regard to ecclesiastical power, yet he had a sincere regard for the

[66] See Note 66. [67] See Note 67. [68] See Note 68.

* The next thing, with a Puritan, to the Bible.—Magnalia, ii. 180.

† Upham's Vane, p. 243.

Church of England."* And he certainly could give *new-lights*, as he calls them, what Baillie, the Presbyterian, styles a very "bold wipe."† How far do these things go to the same account?

Furthermore, though "Cromwell employed all his interest to engage" him "to answer Eikon Basilike, he utterly refused:"—will Mr. Bacon imitate him in this respect, and decline impugning the works of Episcopalians? And, finally, he wrote "A tract proving the Nativity of our Saviour to be on the 25th of December"—a tract replete with prodigious learning, "insomuch," says its editor, "that it will require three lives in the Law, at least, to purchase and peruse those printed pieces and manuscripts, out of which he hath collected his quotations."—Will Mr. Bacon imitate him, and keep next Christmas? He can do so now, and eat mince-pie and custard, without danger of a Puritan fine. Lightfoot once persuaded the Puritans to keep Christmas—so here will be another apology.‡

As to Bunyan's Puritanism, it is probably an honor of which the celebrated tinker would have been somewhat chary. He went by that "fearful name," as Mr. Knowles calls it, which Puritans so often denounced and persecuted—the name of Anabaptist. Had he opened his conventicle in Boston, he would undoubtedly have followed Roger Williams, into the shelter of a wilderness, and the more merciful companionship of untutored savages. And even, as to Bunyan's originality, perhaps Mr. Bacon would have been less anxious to appeal to the book which shows it, as the "most immortal [has immortality degrees?] of the works of human genius," if he had remembered, that Bp. Patrick's Parable of the Pilgrim was considerably older, and was highly popular, (I myself possess a copy of the sixth edition

* General Biographical Dictionary, ix. 150.

† Todd's Life of Brian Walton, i. 41.

‡ Lightfoot's Works, i. 48, 49.

when the work was not five and twenty years in being,) that Patrick confesses its main idea was not original to his own mind; and further, that Southey, who was passionately fond of Bunyan, admits he must have seen Bernard's "Legal proceedings in Man-shire against sin," and moreover, that "there is as much wit in it, as in the Pilgrim's Progress, and it is that vein of wit which Bunyan has worked with such good success."*

And, finally, as to Milton, lord paramount of the domain of Puritanic glory, if Mr. Bacon claims his talent, which no one can doubt, as a consecration of the name of his sect,† what is to become of his Arianism and his polygamy? do they go to the same account? I know not how to dichotomize the Latin Secretary of the Commonwealth, and give his friends his intellect, and his enemies his principles. I remember the question to the military Romish diocesan, who would now and then don the cuirass, and appear at the head of a regiment, "May it please your reverence, if a cannon ball were to send the *Colonel* to Purgatory, what would become of the *Bishop?*" Mr. Bacon may have some papal secret for solving the enigma; but until he produces it, I must hold that he is profoundly welcome to say, Puritanism has brought forth Milton's brain, if I can say, on the other hand, it has likewise brought forth his theories of theology and of morals.‡

V.—A fifth argument in justification of Puritanism, and the last my limits will allow me to notice, is, that its eccle-

* Southey's Bunyan, p. xcii.

† The Edinburgh Review, almost as good authority as Mr. Bacon, insists, however, that Milton was no Puritan. Selections Edinburgh Review, ii. 61.

‡ Baillie's Dissuasive, pp. 116, 144. Edwards' Gangraena, Pt. i. p. 29, for his doctrine of divorce.—Leslie in his Preface to his History of Sin and Heresy, has some very pertinent comments on the *theological* mistakes of the Paradise Lost. Milton's worst mistakes, however, do not appear there, but in his treatise on Christian doctrine.

siastical system "presents the most efficient barrier to the inroads of heresy, and false doctrine, and general corruption, into the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ."*

Says Mr. Bacon, as to what Puritanism (or Congregationalism, if that be a softer appellation,) *can* do, "there is nothing to hinder our churches from exerting their powers and capabilities to the uttermost. The way is open for them to do all the good they can."† And, then, as to what it *has* done, or is doing. Says Mr. Mitchell, "Now this the Congregational system eminently does. It makes practical Christians."‡ Says Dr. Hawes, "The principles and polity of the Congregational churches are powerfully influential in promoting vital godliness."§

Under this head I could say not a little, from my own experience and observation. But there lies before me the testimony of an older witness, a layman, and one the benevolence of whose heart and the soundness of whose understanding, many Congregationalists and Presbyterians, (to say nothing of very many Churchmen,) have often acknowledged. He can speak to far greater effect than I can; though I made my references thicker and more troublesome than ever. Moreover his testimony does, what perhaps it would be called invidious in me to do. It arrays the practical result, concerning the Congregational and Episcopal systems; and must produce a deep impression on all, whom prejudice has not seared with her brand. I allude to a speech made at Boston, by the Hon. Edward. A. Newton, before the Board of Missions for the Diocese of Massachusetts, Jan. 11th, 1842.

Having sketched something of the history and results of

* Punchard's View, 176. † Manual, p. 156.

‡ Practical Church Member, p. 56.

§ Tribute, 2d ed. p. 86.—A decay of vital godliness is unhesitatingly ascribed to contempt for Congregational discipline. Wise's Vindication, 1772, p. 77.

the Congregational system in other lands, Mr. N. comes to the subject more immediately at hand, and observes—

"How has the faith of the Gospel been preserved in the keeping of the Congregational Church here? in what part of this great nation has it planted itself, out of New England? What have been the fruits of its production? I must here premise, that I have it not in my heart to say one word that should give just offence to this respectable denomination. I have in it friends I exceedingly love and respect; I honor and admire the piety and zeal for religion, so many among it have exhibited; but I cannot close my eyes upon the defectiveness, and mischievous workings of its system, and, on an occasion like the present, when I am called upon to enforce the claims of the Church of which I am a member, it is both my right, and my duty, to show its superiority, as well by contrast and comparison as by the exhibition of its own inherent merits. I must not, therefore, be charged with wilful and unnecessary offence, in the prosecution of a warrantable and legitimate object. I entertain no unkindly feelings towards any body of Christians upon earth.

"The origin of the Congregational Church in this country is well known; fleeing, professedly, from persecution in the old world, it established itself in the new, and closed forthwith the door against every competitor. It brought to its aid the entire strength of the civil power, and the no less powerful agency of prejudice and resentment; though a fugitive itself from alleged persecution, it became a stern and unhesitating persecutor of others, and that, too, in a day of extended light and liberality. Nevertheless it could not, and it has not, extended itself beyond its original limits; it could not, and it has not, maintained entire its doctrines and authority therein; it has given way, by degrees, to every species of attack, until made to swarm with almost every imaginable error. Notwithstanding its assumed

claims to scriptural authority, notwithstanding its possession of the exclusive influence of the civil power to enforce its claims, *it has declined*, and manifests increasing symptoms of still further decay. How seldom do we hear of a new Orthodox Congregational Church being erected in any of our towns! who witnesses this Church extending itself in any part of our broad dominion out of New England? Can such an instrumentality, then, be of divine appointment? Again, has she preserved, does she maintain uniformly, her own original standards of faith? Look at her Confession of Faith, established in this very city, in the year 1680, after most mature deliberation, and inquire, who acknowledges it now; or, if any of its individual members do, who preaches it from the pulpit? Who maintains it publicly? who is honest enough, and bold enough, to dare to do so? Can such be the accredited agent of a Master, 'the same yesterday, to-day, and forever,' 'with whom is no variableness, nor shadow of turning?' The age of miracles is passed; the age for God's direct interposition in the affairs of men is alike gone by: he intends now, as is most apparent, to accomplish all his designs on the earth through human agency; he has done all by direct revelation to his vineyard that can be done for it; and now it remains for men to work out the appointed salvation, always in entire dependence upon divine grace. Will a weak and inefficient confederacy, then, such as the Congregational Church is, be competent to such a service? has the like been effectual for any great and good end for any length of time, even? No, sir, it cannot; it may endure for awhile, and do good for a short period in particular states of society, as we have seen it do; but to accomplish and sustain permanent, lasting good, other systems are necessary. This may be shown by a reference to facts. Fifty years ago there were as many Orthodox Congregational ministers in this Commonwealth as there are now. I have no means of pro-

curing a precise and entirely accurate statement on this head, but I have reason to think I am much within the limits of the truth in this particular, because I hear it frequently and confidently affirmed, that one half of the Churches of this order that were Orthodox fifty years ago are the reverse now. Then let it be considered that, within fifty years, the population of this Commonwealth has more than doubled. During this time, this Church has put forth all its energies to sustain itself. It has organized innumerable agencies to suit its ends; caused the laws of the Commonwealth to be modified to render itself more popular; effected the repeal of that most righteous article of our Constitution, which compelled every man to support the public worship of Almighty God according to his ability, because it seemed to operate against its influence; promoted those religious excitements, which have led to such frightful extravagances, and left such fearful results in their train. Still its object is unattained; it *does not increase either in numbers, or in power, or spirituality, but the reverse.* Sir, it gives me no pleasure to lay these statements before you. I do it only under a strong sense of duty, and for just and high considerations.

"Compare now the Episcopal Church, through the same period. Fifty years ago, the Episcopal Church, out of one or two of the Southern States, had hardly any existence in this country; there were in the whole nation, then, one hundred and seventy of its clergy only. While, in this period, the population of the country has more than doubled, and Congregationalism has not advanced one step, the Episcopal Church has added, ONE THOUSAND* to the number of its clergy. While Congregationalism is confined within

* The number of clergy in the Episcopal Church now, is 1231, i. e. Dec. 1844. In 1759 there were but 16 Episcopal clergy in New-York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania! See Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. i. 157.—Note by T. W. C.

the narrow limits of New England, the Episcopal Church has posted itself over the whole length and breadth of the land, and is daily and almost hourly increasing. While Congregationalists are divided, and at variance among themselves, she is united and harmonious. *She cannot be divided.* What she believed and taught in 1680, and from the period of the Reformation, she believes and teaches now, and nothing beside; *no essential error in doctrine, or in practice, has followed in her footsteps.* She is subject to a firm and decided, though mild and moderate government,—one of written laws, founded in reason and experience, just and wise, complete in all its parts. She has a sound and scriptural liturgy, faithfully guarded against sudden and improper changes, which all the Christian world admires. She has also equally well-guarded, fixed, and approved articles of faith, which every intelligent Orthodox Christian admits to be scriptural. She has a body of clergy inferior to none in the country for wisdom, piety, and learning; and where her churches have got beyond the point of struggle for existence, she exhibits the most delightful evidences of sound religious character in her members: and even within the circumscribed influence of her body in our own diocese —yet in the very spring-time of its existence—her salutary influence on other denominations, by the sobriety, order, and intelligence she manifests, is most decisive. Add to all this, she is the most tolerant, mild, and forbearing, towards those who differ from her, of any known body of Christians on the earth. Can we desire better evidences of her being owned and blessed of God?"

To the testimony of Mr. Newton, I subjoin the testimony of a Congregational minister himself.

"Look over New England; you will every where see some religious societies in a broken condition. Every village, every hamlet, is the house of discord. Sanctuaries are prostrate, religion wounded, pastors dismissed; and

where these evils have been less manifest, the secret fire is burning to break out. In every part of New England, you will find two, three, and perhaps ten religious societies, where there should be but one; and these little starvelings are breaking into still new divisions."*

I consider this a faithful representation of the progress and issues of that society, which looks up to Robinson with as sincere filial veneration, as Methodism to Wesley. But I have not the slightest doubt, that Robinson espied flaws in it, when fresh from his plastic hand; and died with an inexpressibly better opinion of the Church of England, than he held in the rash moment, when he broke her bands asunder and cast away her cords from him. Had he lived till now, and beheld his favorite Independency, asserting yearly a wider and wider freedom, throwing off all primitive restraints and checks, till it has made for itself "another Gospel," he would have shrunk back in dismay.† He would have returned to his "first love" and exclaimed with a meek and lowly heart, "O my ancient Mother, take a weary and heavy-laden wanderer to thy bosom. Give me thy yoke and thy burden, that I may find rest to my soul."

* Withington's Review of the late Temperance Movements, 2d edit. Boston, 1840, pp. 11, 12.

† Says Dr. Wisner, of the Old South in Boston, and speaking of his own society, "Of those in the midst of whom she anciently stood, built upon the faith which made our fathers such holy and wonderful men, she alone remains on that foundation firm and unmoved."—History of Old South, p. 65.

Robinson would not have stood still, with a faith that could save so little. As his colleague Smith told him, he would have plunged forward; or, what was infinitely better, returned to his old home and written *backwards* the fond boast of Mr. Oakes: "I look upon the discovery and settlement of the *Congregational way* as the boon, the gratuity, the largess of Divine bounty." Magnalia, ii. 64.—Compare Baillie's Dissuasive, Edit. 1645, pp. 17, 18.

LETTER VI.

In my last letter, I fully intended to embrace the excuses for Puritan peculiarities, and also the reasons for the erection of a Puritan economy on American soil. The excuses were numerous, and required much space for an answer; and this letter must accordingly be devoted to the reasons which are alluded to, and which have been zealously, if not judiciously or eloquently, presented by a Puritan of ancient fame, Nathaniel Morton, Secretary to the Colony established at Plymouth.*

Well, then, as pleasantly as may be, let us give the excuses which have been argued our parting obeisance, and commence a review of an "Apologeticall Narration," quite as famous as that once levelled against the Presbyterians by the ingenuity of Puritans; and which Mr. Hetherington says, in proof of their mutual love, "operated instantaneously like a declaration of war."† In imagination let us go down to the seaside, step on board the Mayflower, freighted with the immortalized "adventurers" in quest of religious freedom, and with a slight violation of the unities, and a gentle anachronism, seat ourselves by old Morton's side, and glance over his redoubtable "New England's Memorial." Be it noted here, by the way, that no inferior neces-

* Morton's Memorial was published in 1669. It has gone through five editions. The last dates 1826! I quote Judge Davis's edition.

† Hetherington, p. 163. Compare Baillie's Dissuasive, p. 92. Life of O. Heywood, p. 60.

sity must have been felt to constrain him to undertake such an essay. The case was one which needed defending, and that of the most earnest character. It had not spoken well for itself; and so it required to have words and a tongue of the right sort put into its mouth. It was high time that the tongue of stammerers should be instructed to speak plainly. So the pen of a ready, at least the readiest writer that could be found, was pressed into the service. This is worth remembering: let us now pass on.

We peep over Morton's shoulder to read his version of the upstirring reasons, as received from themselves, he says, (p. 19,) why his fathers are about to launch upon the "vasty deep." Let no one rudely suspect me of a disposition to enact the part of that naughty counsellor, who as old Flavel says, is always busy at a minister's elbow. Forbid it courtesy! No, I have probably a fuller trust in Morton's sincerity, than he had in Archbishop Laud's, or in that of any one who bore the Babylonish name of Prelate. I would not, if I could, mutilate his work, as Prynne did the diary of the victimized metropolitan. Verily, the ancient Secretary shall stand alone; and I will only venture to put some little commentary in close, if not the most winning contact with his circuitous apology. He gives no less than *five reasons*, arrayed with no mean tactics, why his Puritan kindred should abandon Leyden in Holland, after a ten or eleven years' sojourn there. He would give us comfortable assurance, why they should employ "sundry agents, to treat with several merchants in England, who adventured some CONSIDERABLE SUMS in a way of valuation, to such as went *personally** on the voyage," (p. 22,) though he forgets to tell us why these merchants thought it so necessary to insist upon that awkward word, when they were *all* so passionately solicitous to get away. He goes on to enlighten us about their efforts to

* Plymouth Colony Laws, p. 303, edit. 1836.

obtain "letters patent, for the northern parts of Virginia, of King James of famous memory:" famous, *i. e.*, for persecuting, except in those moments of clemency, when he granted patents and charters to those who said, "the Church of Rome was once a true Church, but so was the Church of England *never!*" He further and finally instructs us, that not altogether devoid, as yet, of that vile commodity called "filthy lucre," they did "buy and fit out" a certain ship called Speedwell; whose name is somewhat ominous of the fact, that her sailing propensities were not entirely disregarded. And that said courier of the ocean was not to be lightly parted with, he permits us to know from the fact, that she was to "stay in the country, and attend upon fishing and such other affairs as might be for the good and benefit of the colony, when they came thither." He does not say what these "other affairs" were; but we must charitably hope that they were not speculations in such an unspiritual thing as trade, or expeditions not too neighborly within the precincts of the Dutch; who had been such long and fast friends to them in their native land. It would have been cruel, indeed, to let the Speedwell run away with fish or furs to which the Dutch preferred a claim.[69] I do not say she did; but proceed to give the *five reasons* in due form and category.

I.—First, then, saith Nathaniel the scribe, (a Puritan indeed, in whom was no Churchmanship at all,) his fathers attempted to establish their own economy on these occidental shores, "Because themselves were of a different language from the Dutch, where they lived, and were settled in their way; insomuch that in ten years' time, whilst their Church sojourned among them, they could not bring them to reform the neglect of observation of the Lord's day, as a Sabbath, or any other thing amiss among them." (p. 19.)

[69] See Note 69.

Now, really, without weighing this according to the severe rules of that system which bids us do as we would be done unto, was it exactly according to the laws of Chesterfield, that the first thing they should attempt, with their kind Dutch entertainers, must be to tell them of their faults? The excuse is, to be sure, that the Puritans were "settled in their way:" *i. e.*, if I read the Secretary with exegetical propriety, and refer these words to *them* rather than their *hosts*. But be it even so. The Dutch, I ween, were "settled in *their* way," quite as composedly, and not a little longer; for the Puritans were but of yesterday, and their leader Robinson, had as "amiable and comfortable carrying on," in changes of opinion, as most people who do not wear a beard and breeches. Whose "settled way," then, should, in the exercise of that charity which hopeth, believeth, and endureth all things, have had foremost consideration? Add to this, too, there were beside some slight obligations to be taken into the account; not dissimilar to those suggested to Robinson's susceptible memory, by good Bishop Hall of Norwich.* The Puritans were, in their own view, refugees for conscience' sake, and escaping for dear life. The Dutch opened their arms widely, and gave them protection, peace, and liberty. "They did," it is the Secretary's absolute confession, "quietly and sweetly enjoy their church-liberties under the States."

And must they, then, after worrying others who tolerated their rebukes with scantier ceremony, begin the same process with those who would indulge them in any or all their notions, (provided they did not inflict them upon themselves,) with "quiet and sweet enjoyment?" Must they besiege them as long and as vigorously as the Greeks did Troy, (two tedious *lustrums*,) to have them "settled in *their* way;" or must they account them so seriously unset-

* Works, x. 113. Oxford, 1837.

tled, as to be unworthy their companionship? To be sure, the phrase "any other thing amiss among them" is broad enough to embrace errors, heresies, and schisms, of the hugest magnitude. But as the "observation of the Lord's day as a Sabbath" was the head and front of their offending, I must consider this as the most flagitious defalcation with which the Dutch were chargeable. And mark, too, the phraseology. It is not that the Dutch neglected the Lord's day. By no means. They neglected to observe it *as a Sabbath.* And what did that phrase mean in a Puritan vocabulary? Much more than it does in ours. It meant a Sabbath as strict as was ever kept by the exactest Pharisee. "Myself have heard it preached," says Bishop Montague, "that it is not lawful for us to dress any meat upon the Sabbath as they style it, or the Lord's day, but they that do so break the Sabbath."* And, to crown the climax, Sabbath-breaking was placed upon a level with actual murder.†

But the continental Protestant notion of the Lord's day was not so stern. Calvin allowed the old men to play at bowls, and the young men to train at Geneva, after Sunday evening service.‡ And much the same notion of the Lord's day prevails, to this time, over all Protestant Europe.§ And the Dutch, doubtless, were as liberal, and not one whit more so, than Calvin and every other Protestant, (a Puritanical one excepted,)[70] then was or has ever since been, respecting the religious observance of the day of our Sav-

[70] See Note 70.

---

* Acts and Monuments, p. 480. Jephson on the Sabbath, pp. 398, 400.

† Grant's English Church, i. 455.—Down to 1769, the dead could not be buried in Massachusetts on a Sunday, without license from a magistrate.—Felt's Ipswich, p. 199.

‡ Laud's Troubles, p. 343. Dissenter Disarmed, p. 28, Pt. ii. edit. 1681.

§ Eylert's Frederick William III. pref. p. xi.

iour's resurrection.* Yet this the Puritans could not endure. It was not enough for them, that Popish Christendom should be corrected by their pattern, all Protestant Christendom must undergo the same transformation; or the inevitable conclusion was, (sure as the law of gravity,) "They know not, neither will they understand; they walk on still in darkness; all the foundations of the earth are out of course." (Ps. lxxxii. 5.) And, again, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Ps. xi. 3.) What but renounce a nation of incorrigible anti-sabbatarians, and fly from them to "the uttermost parts of the sea?"

Alas, that no conclusion but such as this could be a safe one; and, too, in virtual denunciation of all Protestant Christendom, but their own microscopic sect—a cloud like a man's hand upon the wide ecclesiastical canopy! Why, what if the Dutch, in close imitation of Calvin, were less strict in the observance of a Christian Sabbath, than Pharisees of a Jewish one? They were liberal to the utmost extent of the wishes of such, as were among the most "settled in their way" earth ever saw, in granting and honoring the rights of conscience. Ought not such an all-powerful sweetener as this to have softened the tongues of those who, but yesterday, had exalted such rights to the very zenith among sacred things? They had forsaken home, and all they there held precious, to enjoy these rights inviolably. And this, too, when, says one who would defend them by fire or water, "A *little* bending of the conscience, a *little* relinquishment of duty, and a *slight* outward submission to nitred authority, would have kept them in possession of

* It may be questioned, very fairly, whether the excitement raised by the Puritans against the usual Protestant notion of Sunday, was other than political in its aim. When they got into power, they regarded all days alike; very much as the Quakers do now. Brady's Clavis Calendaria, vol. i. 105. E. N. Neale on Feasts and Fasts, p. 191. Neale refers to Brady, but is in error about the page.

their quiet homes, and spared them the sacrifices and perils of a removal into this distant and desert land."* But *less* bending, *less* relinquishment, *slighter* submission still, was required in Holland—none at all in fact, if they would allow their gracious hosts *their own* rights of conscience, and not give them the tug of a ten years' controversy, to "bring them to reform." Yet even this little, this less, this least of all concessions, they, for courtesy's sake, for honor's sake, for peace' sake, for gratitude's sake, for Christian charity's godlike sake, could not grant. No, the old text must be new vamped, even for benefactors, *Ne ungulam esse relinquendam*—not a hoof must be left behind. England was an intolerable abode, because England would not think as they did; and Holland, sheltering and shielding Holland, where conscience was free as the winds of heaven, if she also would not think as they did, was scarce an atom better, and must forthwith be cast behind the back, "*Ire pedes quocumque ferent, quocumque per undas.*" Can we be amazed, if such a temper as this was looked upon with some trifling degree of jealousy; and that they who indulged it, suffered the (to them) unendurable penalty of being "watched?"†

II.—The second reason of the Secretary, derived from their own self-defending lips, is, "Because their own countrymen, who came over to join with them, by reason of the hardness of the country, soon spent their estates; and were then forced to return back to England, or to live very meanly."‡

* Hawes's Tribute, 2d edition, p. 100.

† European Settlements, ii. 138.

‡ "A mean and low condition," according to their own definition, is, when they are able "to furnish other places with corn, beef, pork, masts, clapboard, pipe-staves, fish, beaver, otter, and other commodities."—See Hutchinson's Hist. i. 449. And I am the more suspicious about the mean living of the Puritans in Holland; for a Presbyterian, their contem-

So, then, Holland was a *hard* country, after all. We begin to think that some of that high-blown praise about its sweet liberty, is going to burst like the soap-bubble. But let us look a little nearer. Was it a hard country for religion's sake? Not at all. A hard country for what, then? A hard country for making money. Estates were more apt to be spent there than to be accumulated; and one was more likely to live meaner than he was wont, than to be clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day.

We have read of sufferers, (Heb. x. 34,) who took joyfully the spoiling of their earthly goods, when their souls were free, and they knew in themselves they had in heaven a better, and an enduring substance. But Mr. Secretary Morton must permit us to doubt, (I fall insensibly into the use of the plural, so confident am I multitudes of Churchmen think with me,) whether he has given us a clue for the discovery of many such, in the congregation of the Puritans at Leyden. No. For they had "church-liberties" to the full; but there was a craving for something beyond them all. Was that something more precious? They had fled from England, as from Egypt the house of bondage. They were in Holland, where none troubled them for a solitary opinion. And yet, when they saw their estates waning, and mean living hovering nigh, the language of their secret souls was, "England, with all thy faults, I love thee still; for there my estate will not take wings so fast, and mean living will not persecute me, if bishops do." And so, some went back. Yes, the Secretary himself admits it. England was made a home a second time, if money could be saved, and the pangs of mean living could be avoided, *i. e.* of living meaner than one's neighbors; for meaner living

porary, says that many of them there "lived in safety, pompe, and ease, enjoying their own wayes and freedome." Edwards's Antapologia, p. 2.

than ever awaited them on the inhospitable shores of Massachusetts. In other words, to bring the matter to a point in a single sentence, Persecution was a tolerable evil; but the loss of property and outward station in society was not.

I do, (bitterly prejudiced as many will account me,) I do look upon this conclusion with the sincerest pity. But I am not to be blamed, for making the case of the Secretary worse than he himself has made it. I could wish his words unsaid, and his argument drowned in the depths of the sea his brethren were tossed upon. But there both stand, there both will stand, as long as the English language is read or written. And so long will it remain, by confession of judgment, that there were sorrows, connected with their pockets and their palates, more terrible than the sorrows of a harassed conscience, to the Puritans at Leyden.[71]

Is this conclusion, notwithstanding, deemed an unfeeling one? Look at it in parallel with the case of the hapless Huguenots, and judge. The Huguenots left France, not because France would not think as they did, but because they must think as France did, at the peril of annihilation to their very name. It was not with them, the prayer-book or a shilling fine; but it was the mass or the musket; confession to the priest, or a vain cry for mercy to the sabreing dragoon. Notwithstanding, where is the Huguenot's book of lamentations, not for the loss of his estate, his table, or his wardrobe, but for his baptism of blood and fire? Where are the annual eulogists of his almost martyrdom, the merry song in derision of his persecutors, the feast, the shout, and the clapping of hands? And echo answers, Where?*

The Puritan could voluntarily forsake his native land, and an adopted land of sweet church-liberty, and live in a

[71] See Note 71.

* Yet their martyrs, by one calculation, are 945,000. See Quick's Synodicon, i. pp. lix, lx.

wilderness, if, according to the language of the first governor of Plymouth, he could follow his trading roundly.* He could abandon his new home, and recross the ocean, when a cow which once brought twenty pounds, had fallen as low as six.† But the Huguenot was content with any loss, but that of the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord. All climes were bright for him, where, though in a way which his foes called heresy, he could worship his fathers' God. He could subsist in Holland,‡ or in England, and thrive there too, both temporally and spiritually. The Puritan could subsist only where his own word and will were despotic law.§ Oh, I honor the Huguenot with all my heart; and if I take from the Puritan a talent of the praise which he clamorously calls for, and give it to the modest Huguenot, though he have ten already, my conscience tells me I do an act of simple duty, which justice herself requires.||

III.—The third reason of the prim, apologetic Secretary, is the following: "That many of their children, through the extreme necessity that was upon them, although of the best dispositions, and graciously inclined, and willing to bear part of their parents' burthens, were oftentimes so oppressed with their heavy labors, that although their spirits were free and willing, yet their bodies bowed under the weight of the same, and became decrepit in early youth, and the vigor of nature consumed in the very bud. And that which was very lamentable, and of all sorrows most heavy to be borne, was, that many by these occasions, and

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, iii. 59. Compare Chalmers' Annals, p. 416.

† Chalmers' Annals, pp. 165, 166.

‡ The Huguenots maintained carefully a union with the Dutch Protestants. Quick's Synodicon, i. 180.

§ See Zurich Letters, to see how early this was discovered, Nos. 94, 114, 115.

|| Compare Hawks's Virginia, p. 79.

the great licentiousness of youth in that country, and the manifest temptations of the place, were drawn away by evil examples into extravagant and dangerous courses, getting the rein upon their necks, and departing from their parents: some became soldiers, others took upon them far voyages by sea, and others some worse courses, tending to dissoluteness, and the destruction of their souls, to the great grief of their parents, and the dishonor of God; and that the place being of great licentiousness and liberty to children, they could not educate them, nor could they give them due correction, without reproof or reproach from their neighbors."

Well, reader, we have at last finished a reason, which you may have thought a copy of a count in some old indictment. And now, but that the land to which it alludes has been already mentioned, and one at least of its terrible crimes enumerated, I should be amazingly disposed to make you guess, whether this land were, or were not, about the worst province in all the Pope's dominions. It is a land so grinding in its toils, that children become decrepit there in early youth, and the vigor of nature is consumed before it swells out into blossom. It is a land of such terrible licentiousness, that the best dispositions, and dispositions additionally fortified by grace, are not in safety there. It breeds manifold temptations, supplies evil examples without stint, gives swing to extravagant and dangerous courses. It makes children first disobedient to their parents, and then deserters from them. It makes soldiers and sailors of many, who would otherwise have shone in lay-preaching among the "Gifted Brethren."* It makes others dissolute, and suicides of their souls. It discourages education and domestic discipline.

* "It was also a part of the system [Independency] to allow of the preaching of 'gifted brethren.'"—Life of Oliver Heywood, p. 58. Heywood, by the way, was a Presbyterian.

But where, (you would say, if you did not know what land was meant,) where, out of the domains of Popery, or Prelacy, can a land so deplorable as this be found? Can this be a land on which a Calvinist has ever so much as shaken off the dust of his feet? could Calvinists ever hold a conclave within its polluted borders? Why, Dr. Hawes would fain persuade us, that "where there is the most Calvinism there is the least crime."* There must be some sad misnomer: such language cannot be intended for any land, where Calvinism has so much as floated in the dreams of theological polemics. But, oh, it may not be. This Puritanical portraiture is drawn for a land, where Calvinism has arrayed itself in all its glory.† Dort, a name never to be forgotten in its annals, belongs to a city whose latitude differs from that of Leyden, only by twenty minutes! And the Synod of Dort sat in 1618 and 1619: but the year before the Puritans abandoned Holland, as too incorrigibly Sabbath-breaking, licentious, and soul-destroying; as containing a people so stolid, or so desperate, that a ten years' incessant Puritan tuition "could not bring them to reform."

In England, prelatic England, man, the most precious of all creatures, was, if a Puritan, more vile and base than the earth he trod upon—at least according to Puritanic annalists.‡ But this was agreeable to "the course of nature." And could it not be a thousand-fold better for him to tread the soil of Holland—of Calvinistic Holland? Ah! there seemed to be the same incongeniality between that and a Puritanic sole, as between the same sole and a ground prolific of Babylonish prelacy. And the ready and straight conclusion is, that there was no ground upon which a Puritan could tread with comfort, of which he could not claim the

* Tribute, 2d ed. 64.

† See its treatment of the Arminians, Grotius and Barnevelt. Watkins's Biog. Dict. p. 586.

‡ Graham's North America, i. 241.

ownership and the supremacy—the supremacy for body, soul, and spirit—the supremacy for government and religion—the supremacy for his own polity in Church and State, and for that alone. Episcopacy we expect him to repudiate. For Presbytery, and Calvin's Institutes, and the land of Dort Synods, we do look for some grains of allowance from him. But we are grievously disappointed. He only is right, and may pour forth oracular truth and law. He can call a Dutchman, if a Calvinist and a protector, a Sabbath-breaker, and guilty of untold "things amiss." And if the honest Dutchman in turn tell him, that he unduly corrects his children, and by harshness perhaps will drive them into the very extremes he deprecates, does he remember there is such a text in David as this: "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; and let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head"? (Ps. cxli. 5.) Or does he rather draw himself stiffly up, and say, "Presumptuous dictator, I shall forthwith put between you and me the effectual separation of three thousand miles?"

IV.—The fourth reason of the advocating Secretary is, "That their posterity would in a few generations become Dutch, and so lose their interest in the English nation; they being desirous rather to enlarge his Majesty's dominions, and to live under their natural prince."*

Become Dutch? Well, and if they did, could it be such a formidable disaster, when the Dutch "offered them great favor,"† and when the Synod of Dort had just extinguished Arminianism, and made Calvinism of the first water prevalent far and wide? There is a strange want of unanimity between such apprehensions, and the zeal of Dr. Hawes to prove his Puritanical forefathers Calvinists, of whom the

* Gorges professed the same motives for *his* settlements, as the Puritans for *theirs*, in their fourth and fifth reasons—why not give *him* a much credit? Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 69, 70.

† Chalmers' Annals, p. 106.

world was not worthy.* To dread melting away into the foremost Calvinistic community on the globe, and then, in the next breath, to glorify Calvinism as the sublimest form of Christianity, may be consistent with Puritan tactics; but it tallies poorly with the expectations of common honesty and common sense.†

But there is a makeweight to be thrown into the balance. O yes, I was overlooking it. By being amalgamated with Calvinists, they would "lose their interest in the English nation," and some fine opportunities to enlarge the domain of Episcopal royalty. And so, attachment to a nation they had voluntarily forsaken, and the hope of enlarging the conquests of an Episcopal crown, were dearer than fellowship with Calvinism in its most genuine form.

And must my iron fate be to keep a perfectly sober countenance, under such argumentation as this, recorded, as it no doubt was, with most edifying sedateness, and especially when I see it endorsed by a philosophical champion of democracy?‡ May I not be allowed one smile? a little one? No! Well, then let me try another strain.

"Desirous rather to enlarge his Majesty's dominions"?

* Tribute, 2d ed. p. 113.

† With equal felicity and logic Dr. Hawes says, of the intolerant legislation of Massachusetts, that its laws "were designed to protect and support their own ecclesiastical and civil order; and not to operate at all as persecuting or oppressive enactments, against Christians belonging to other sects." (Tribute, p. 113.) And I presume a Jesuit would prefer the same excuse, in behalf of the Inquisition. This was never designed to thwart and harass Protestants. O no, surely not. It was only meant to build up Romanism!

Mr. Chalmers employs Dr. Hawes's logic admirably, in accounting for the establishment of Episcopacy in Virginia. "The Church of England was formally established, in order 'to prevent innovation in matters of religion.'" (Chalmers's Revolt Am. Coll. i. 37.) Dr. H. must endorse Chalmers, or repudiate himself.

‡ Bancroft, i. 303, 304.

Why, they loved him as curiously as the Scotch presbytery, who would not use the ceremony of unction at his coronation, till they learned that a bishop would do it without them; and then, to be beforehand with a Babylonish prelate, they found a conscience for doing it full quickly.* They would help him, if thereby they might unhelp Churchmen; and here we must not forget their willingness to obtain a footing in "the northern parts of Virginia," where they would be at least in the neighborhood of Churchmen. Could they have had an eye on the birthright of those Churchmen in America? Could they have hoped, in any way, to supplant them? I do not say they had the one, or did the other; but when I find that a Dominican, like Father Hennepin, was quite ready to be a missionary for the Protestant William III., so he might do disservice to the Jesuits, (a fact which is soon evident upon a careful perusal of Hennepin's work upon America,) is it morally impossible that a Puritan would be a missionary for the Episcopal James I., if he might thereby thwart the plans, or, at the very least, enter into the labors of pioneering prelatists? When did a Puritan ever flatter royalty from the love of it? His freer language the rather savored of the classics of Billingsgate: witness the achievements of Penry, Throgmorton, Endall, and Fenner.† Still he could command another tone and other words, when his worldly interest, the hope of fish and furs, and trading roundly, prompted to more soothing exhibitions. Then, his stiff, rectangular tongue could be as pliant as an osier in the breeze, or pour words as gentle as "the waters of Shiloah that go softly." Isa. viii. 6.

King James experienced this in his day. King Charles II. was saluted by the same discovery, before the century had dropped its curtain. The Charter, that priceless Charter,

* Spottiswood, p. 381. edit. 1655.

† Grant's Eng. Ch. i. 446. Compare Maskell's Martin Mar-Prelate, p. 213.

which Massachusetts regarded as "heart's blood,"* was in fearful peril. It had unquestionably been transcended in many particulars. To mention one for a multitude: no provision existed in the Charter for such a legislative body as a House of Representatives, or any legislative body separate from the Governor and his assistants.† So that terrible writ of *quo warranto*, or, "By what authority doest thou these things," was a daily apprehension. Agents were sent to England, to keep aloof the dreaded spectre. "And," says Chalmers, (p. 412,) "according to the never-failing practice, a fast-day was appointed to pray for the preservation of the patent, for success to their agency."‡ Thus carefully fortified, what did the members of this commission do? Duly impressed with the weightiness of their charge, they proved themselves Chrysostoms in very deed. They took the advice of an intelligent friend, and tendered the Lord Chancellor "an acknowledgment of two thousand guineas for his Majesty's private use:"§

> "*Aurum potabile* being
> The only medicine for the civil magistrate,
> T' incline him to a feeling of the cause."

But this is slander. Chalmers knew too well, that what he duly calls "this delicate transaction," would be severely questioned; and on pp. 461,462, he takes abundant care to give original authorities which well corroborate it. And he adds, what I must add, in strict justice to others, if in derogation of the foremost State of all our realm, "There is no evidence in history, or records, or papers, to show that any of the

* Chalmers, p. 461.

† Trumbull's History of the United States, p. 96.

‡ Puritan fasting and praying was one way of killing bishops.—Magnalia, i. 280. Gauden well said, they could have feasts and fasts enough for their own ends. Tears and Sighs, &c. p. 112, edit. 1659.

§ Chalmers, p. 413. Compare the agency of Hugh Peters & Co., given on page 172 of Chalmers.

other colonies employed similar means to gain their ends in England."[72] *

Let those dispute Chalmers' authority, who have had as free access as he had to documentary testimony in the Plantation Office of England. And let it likewise be remembered, that in his opinions of the conduct of the Puritans, he is sustained by the Presbyterian Dr. Robertson; to say nothing of thousands of Presbyterians, in the days of the Westminster Assembly, and the Protectorate of Cromwell. Mr. Graham, indeed,† looks at both Chalmers and Robertson with a jealous eye. Yet he freely acknowledges, that it is impossible to tax them with ignorance, that it would be presumptuous to charge them with want of discernment, and uncharitable to reproach them for malignity. And this probably is quite enough, by way of canvass, for the fourth reason. Let us now hear the venerable Secretary's fifth and last.

V.—It is as follows: "Fifthly and lastly, and which was not the least, a great hope and inward zeal they had, of laying some good foundation, or at least to make some way thereunto, for the propagating and advancement of the Gospel of the kingdom of Christ, in those remote parts of the world; yea, although they should be but as stepping-stones unto others, for the performance of a great work."

Here we have something, which bears reason and charity and amiable humility on its front. If true to the letter, and there were no unfortunate *sixth* and *seventh* reasons, which historical justice requires me to specify, the offences of the first four might be blotted out by a tear of pity. But alas! with these bowing-down pilgrims, willing to be but stepping-stones for their betters, what was "the Gospel of Christ," and what a lawful "way" for its "propagation and

[72] See Note 72.

* Chalmers, p. 462. † North America, i. 260. London, 1827.

advancement?" The Gospel resided with their little flock *alone*.* The way to spread it was one, of which their private judgment was the only competent inventor.† As St. Augustine said of the Donatists, "nisi quod ipsi faciunt, nihil rectum existiment;" so they would esteem nothing right, but what was done by their own selves. The Calvinists of Holland, as we have seen already, experienced scanty consideration from them. The Presbyterians of England were not treated with more favor. Those very Presbyterians charged them with dislike of themselves, and obstinate separation. "You rend yourselves from us," was their remonstrance, "and not as from churches of the same rule, but as churches differing in the rule, with a dislike of us, and a protestation that you cannot join with us, as fixed members, without sin. You hear us preach, not as persons in office, but as gifted men only; and some of you refuse to hear us preach at all. You renounce all church communion with us as members, and not only so, but you invite our people from us by telling them, [the italics are Presbyterian and not mine,] *that they cannot continue with us without sin.*"‡ This may seem strange language from Presbyterian pens, yet it comes from the Ministers and Elders met together in a Provincial Assembly. Nor is it by any means as strong a representation of the temper of Puritanism, as they give further on, when the momentum of argument had supplied them with more force. Then they bear down upon it with an intensity, which in me would be unpardonable and shocking. "In a word," they say, p. 147,

* Maskell's Martin Mar Prelate, pp. 155, 219, 220.

† Gauden's Tears and Sighs, &c. p. 139.

‡ Vindication of the Presbyteriall Government, &c. pp. 130, 131. London. Licensed, &c. 1650.—The word "licensed" should be noted; for in Puritan days the liberty of the press was abridged. It was one of *their* requests at the Hampton Court conference that it should be.—Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 183.

"First, *you run away from us*, [again Presbyterian italics,] and then for the most part turn Independents, then Antinomians, then Anabaptists, then Arminians, then some of you Socinians, Anti-Scripturists, Anti-Trinitarians, still waxing worse, deceiving and being deceived, and in the conclusion mere Atheists." How would this Presbyterian history of Puritanism in England, some two hundred years ago, contrast with its history in Massachusetts, as developed by facts familiar to living thousands?

The ever calumniated Laud could say, under "the burden of sixty-five years complete," the time "draws on apace," "that I must go and give God and Christ an account of the talent committed to my charge; in which God for Christ Jesus' sake be merciful to me; who knows that however in many weaknesses, yet I have with a faithful and single heart, (bound to his free grace for it,) labored the meeting, the blessed meeting, of truth and peace in his Church, and which God in his own good time will (I hope) effect. To him be all honor and praise for ever. Amen."* And thus he could close one of the most important and earnest efforts, which Protestantism ever made against Popery.† Nevertheless, say the Puritans, he was a Papist at heart. He shed his last drop of blood as a member of the Protestant Church of England; for he professed himself her steadfast son with his latest breath. But he died, said the Puritans, with a lie in his right hand: they declared his ruddy face a painted one, till the pale features, quivering in death, stopped their malignant vituperation.‡

Yet, for argument's sake, let us grant them faith for all they want to allege against the murdered prelate, and his still assassinated memory. If we are to take their *ipse*

* Conference with Fisher; at the end.

† See Leslie's Works, new edition, i. 498. Or, sermon on marriages, sec. xix. For other references to Laud, see Note 55.

‡ Southey's Book of the Church, chap. xvii.

dixits against Churchmen, all I would ask in turn is, not that we may take the *ipse dixits* of Churchmen, but of Presbyterians, aye of *genuine* Presbyterians, against themselves. Would this be too bold a proposition, though it do come from "Babylon?" If not, I hold it easy to picture them in as bad a plight, as they have ever pictured Laud, with nothing to aid me but a Presbyterian pencil. The quotations I have just given may be taken as a specimen. Thomas Edwards, Robert Baillie, and above all Clement Walker, who wrote a history of Independency [Congregationalism] and died in a dungeon for it, will supply me with a thousand more, if necessary. It is a grand, a prodigious mistake, to suppose that Puritanism ever loved the Presbytery better than Prelacy. Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, Anabaptism, Quakerism, presented equal unloveliness to its "evil eye." Its Ishmaelite hand was against them all. Still it would fain persuade us, it could willingly become a "stepping-stone" for any body, who would give free course to a disenthralling Gospel! Oh, who is it, that while he calleth himself "a servant of servants," is yet, like Leviathan, "a king over all the children of pride?"* And is such language, measured by the practice which went with it, to be taken as the utterance of a meek and lowly heart, or as an echo from the banks of the yellow Tiber?

VI.—The entire number of apolegetic reasons given by the anxious Secretary is but five. I have hinted that it might be necessary for me to add some to his list. Accordingly, I must announce, among those omitted by him, That the Puritans in Holland were not harmonious among themselves, and that therefore it became desirable for them to separate.

This is a formidable reason, asserted by no lower au-

* Gauden says of some of their speeches, they were "big as Behemoth and disdainfull as Leviathan."—Tears and Sighs, &c. p. 162.

thority than Hutchinson, whom all parties pronounce accurate.* But to Puritan eyes, it is like flint to steel, it endangers us with fire. Belknap cannot endure it, and strips the Governor of Massachusetts of some of his historic laurels without delay.† Yet Belknap was poorly qualified to assume the office of a censor. He himself, in stating the five reasons of Secretary Morton, takes special care to smother up, in the *fourth*, all reference to the British king; and if I, therefore, have been somewhat incredulous about its loyalty, I hope I may be pardoned.‡

However, the variance of Hutchinson and Belknap shows me that my position must be fortified; and in order to display some of the anti-amiable qualities of Puritan associations, it becomes necessary for me to summon other witnesses. Presbyterians are among my favorites, and therefore I shall commence with them.

Says Mr. Edwards, in that book so tastily called "The Gangrene"—"The Independent church-way is a way of error, confusion, division, a way that God never shined upon nor blessed spiritually, with the blessing of edification, oneness of heart, and peace in their churches; but hath been a bitter root of division, contentions, errors, in all places of the world wherever such churches have been set up; as in New England, Holland, Island of Providence, the Summer Islands, Old England."§ Says Mr. Hetherington, who hits not quite so near the mark, as he does not

* Hutchinson's Hist. ii. 405.

† Biog. ii. 165, 166.—Belknap, however, is by no means so bad as Master Cotton in his reply to Baillie's Dissuasive. He professes to quote, and puts quotation marks; but he leaves out one of the five reasons, and cuts and carves to suit himself with entire freedom. See his Reply, pp. 14, 15.

‡ Belknap's Biog. ii. 158.

§ Gangraena, Pt. ii. p. 170. Compare Baillie's Dissuasive, chap. iv. —See more to similar effect in Edwards's Antapologia, p. 294, and the numerous references there given.—See also Note 73.

actually mention Holland, but who hits near enough to enable us to follow the stream up to the fountain—"In New England, where their system had at first freedom to put forth its native tendencies, it was found to be absolutely incompatible with the peace and good order of society; and therefore the very necessity and duty of self-preservation constrained the Independents of that country to make such alterations in their system, as might save them from total disorganization."*

And, now, having cast some light upon the subject from Presbyterian lamps, let us even go to their very own, to see if something more than a glimmer will not greet us. The following sentence is from a letter of one James Shirley, who was an agent and a friend in London for the colony at Plymouth. He thus speaks to its Governor, under date of March 8, 1629. "Mr. Bradford, give me leave to put you in mind of one thing. Here are *many* of your Leyden people, now come over; and though I have ever had good thoughts of them, yet believe not every one what they shall report of Mr. Allerton;† he hath been a trusty, honest friend to you all, either there or here. And if any do, (as I know some of them are apt to,) speak ill of him, believe them not. Indeed, they have been very unreasonably chargeable, yet grudge and are not contented. Verily their indiscreet carriage, here, hath so abated my affection towards them, as were Mrs. Robinson well over, [the widow of the minister who died in 1625,] I would not disburse one penny for the rest."‡ Dr. Morse, whom none will accuse of any lack of

* Hist. West. Ass. p. 196. Also Baillie's Dissuasive, chap. iii. And Jus Div. Min. Evang. pp. 152, 153.—Mr. Graham speaks of "the violent, divisive, and contentious spirit, that long continued to ferment" in New England.—North America, i. 266. It is amusing to see him speak of Cotton's *mildness* as its cure, when we remember the "Bloody Tenet."

† Allerton was from Plymouth: another agent of the colony.

‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, iii. 69.

partiality, for any thing which bore the name of Puritan, is constrained to write thus. The portrait he is about to draw, prevents him from using that venerated word, and he calls his ancestors simple "emigrants." And then he avows the melancholy fact, that "as soon as they were removed from ecclesiastical courts, and possessed of a patent allowing liberty of conscience, they fell into disputes and contentions among themselves." He goes on, a little lower: "The unhappy divisions and contentions in Massachusetts still prevailed, and in the year 1636, Gov. Winthrop strove to *exterminate* the opinions which he disapproved." Once more: "The whole colony of Massachusetts, at this time, was in a violent ferment."*

And *but* once more; for I *must* quote Richard Baxter, an authority of matchless weight with Puritans, to put this subject effectually beyond further controversy. This is his castigation of the Puritans *every where*, though with an especial reference to those of New England: "And, truly, they that think of the present state of Hartford, and some other churches in New England, (which I will not here make a narrative of,) methinks, should fear separations, schisms, or divisions, from or in the churches called Independent, as much as those of a different discipline do as to theirs: *if not somewhat more on several accounts.*"†

Now, in view of such testimony as this, who can persuade us, without oracular authority, that the usual elements of Puritanic discord did not exist at Leyden? Secretary Morton, and Belknap after him,‡ may congratulate themselves that they had no such *felonious* quarrels, as required the interference of the magistrates. But, surely, Morton himself tells us of disputations with the Dutch about their

* Geog. London edit. 1792, pp. 209, 210.

† The Cure of Church Divisions, 2d edit. p. 250.

‡ Biog. ii. 158.

Sabbath-breaking, and other unmentioned "things amiss."* He allows that their neighbors did not spare "reproofs" nor yet "reproaches," for their high-handed government of children. And Belknap also admits, that they fled from a congregation at Amsterdam, "who had the same religious views, and had emigrated before them,"† because *that* congregation "fell into controversy," and Robinson feared "the infection might spread." Nay, more, he admits that Robinson himself afterwards caught this "infection;" for he had a pamphlet warfare with the minister of his quondam brethren.‡

But I need argue this case no further. Robinson himself, as already seen, was unsteady in his opinions; nor did he ever expect to reach *terra firma*, if he followed their leadings, instead of returning to the "old paths where is the good way." In one of the last, or the very last of sermons which he preached to the "emigrants," is this remarkable

* The word "amiss" has a curious connection with Robinson's name. He was a petulant wit, according to Belknap, and nicknamed Dr. Ames, who rebuked him for his separation, Dr. Amiss. But Ames's good temper cooled him down.—Belknap's Biog. ii. 161. This little circumstance shows that Robinson found it best to curb that "touchy humor" which he forewarned the "Pilgrims" not to indulge. And, probably, he began to treat the Dutch with a courtesy he never could bestow on his mother-church, while he was in his native land. But Bishop Hall warned him how he awoke the ire of the Dutch; for slow though they might be, their wrath would be effectual, if once roused. "Say so," he says, alluding to what he might be incautious enough to say in Holland, *as* he had been in England—"Say so if you dare. I fear they would soon make the ocean your Red Sea, and Virginia your wilderness."—Hall's Works, x. 102, 103. Or, sec. 52, of his "Apology against Brownists."

† Young's Chron. p. 34, note.

‡ Biog. ii. 157, note. Young's Chron. p. 451, note.—Well might Bishop Hall tell Smith and Robinson, when they were wrangling, "Say if you can that the Church of England (if she were not yours) is not a heaven to Amsterdam."—Hall's Works, x. 180, 181, or Epistles, Decade iii. 1.

profession: "I am very confident that the Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word." In anticipation, then, he was an advocate of the modern fashionable theory of development. Like Dr. Priestly, he did not know how, when, or where, his opinions would become fixed. And could the sentiments and feelings of a people, to whom such a man was the pastor, be permanent or harmonious? As well might the troubled sea no more cast up mire and dirt, or submit to the fetters with which a royal fool once tried to curb its waves.

VII.—And now for the seventh and last reason, and the close of this letter. It reminds me, in *name* at least, of what the lawyers call the "negative pregnant." I am not lawyer enough to compare it any further; and they will not therefore accuse me of an error of trespass. It is this. The "Pilgrims" did NOT sail for New England because they were persecuted.

Now, the old and unchangeable story is, that they came to Plymouth because they were persecuted and driven thither. But Morton's own Memorial tells us, that in Holland they did sweetly enjoy their church-liberties, and that the Dutch so valued them for fidelity in business, that they "strove for their custom." Indeed, he says expressly, "it was their own free choice and motion" which induced them to depart.*

With what sort of countenance, then, can an honest chronicler, or a truthful orator, look at Plymouth rock, as the first American foothold for harried victims of persecution? The Plymouth settlers are the only ones who can fairly be called "Pilgrims," as Mr. Young has already informed us. We ask these Pilgrims why they come, and

* Memorial, Davis's edit. p. 21.—Gorges, whom the Pilgrims called a great friend, (Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, iii. 63,) has another version of this particular, as we shall by and by see.—See Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser vi. 73.

they array before us five long and goodly reasons, where the word persecution clinks not a syllable of its hated sounds. Were not these reasons the best you had to give? Doubtless. Did you not think them ample? Beyond a question. And why, then, have your eulogists transcended your own dictation? why have they dared to do so? why have they taken upon them this unprompted, uncalled-for task, for more than two hundred years, which have tired at least six generations of mortal men into the long sleep of death? Why does the cry rise, louder if any thing than ever, from New England Societies, orations, songs, and dinner-tables, The Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, fugitives escaping for actual life from persecution? Does not history cry, "Shame upon such misrepresentation! by the solemn testimony of facts, and their own lips, they did not"? And yet this cry is undiminished, and the speech, and the lyric, and the feast go their annual round. Buf if a solitary Churchman do venture a single whisper, that Laud was as much a martyr as the Puritans were pilgrims, such a storm of hisses, sneers, and execrations, pelts his luckless head, as might make him suspect the days of Martin Mar-Prelate were come back again. His only refuge, therefore, (thank Heaven a Puritan cannot take that from him,) is to utter himself to One who is never prejudiced, "My soul is sore vexed: but thou, O Lord, how long?"

P. S.—A *ninth* reason might have been added from Chalmers' Annals, p. 85, viz., "They became unhappy in their situation, because they foresaw the destruction of their society in the *toleration* they enjoyed." Something like this appears to be Robertson's account of the matter, in the tenth book of his History of America. See also Bozman's Maryland. Note O, p. 376.

What is not a little remarkable, the Puritans of Massachusetts, (Mr. Young will not allow *them* the honored title

of Pilgrims,) give us *eight* reasons for *their* removal; and among the eight, the being driven out by persecution, is *not* to be found as one. See them written by Higginson himself.—Hutchinson's Collection, pp. 24, 27, 28. If any one doubts that Higginson wrote them, let him consult Felt's Salem, p. 16; or pp. 69, 70, of his new edition, volume first.

So, then, as "themselves do declare it," (to use Master Cotton's favorite appeal,) neither the Pilgrims of Plymouth, nor the *quasi* Pilgrims of Massachusetts, were driven to New England by persecution.

LETTER VII.

In the last letter, my readers had an opportunity to see and canvass the reasons which prompted the removal of the Puritans from Holland. In all probability, they easily understood how the Colonial Secretary, though stiff as steel in opposition to Prelacy, could practise "a little bending," to avoid such unamiable reasons as the *sixth* and *seventh.* The Puritans (let us admit the current tale for the object in view,) were *quarrelled with* by the Government of England, and sought refuge among the Dutch. There they quarrel *with one another* or *their friends*, "and the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder, one from the other." Robinson forsakes Smith and his congregation at Amsterdam, though they had "the same religious views." He goes to Leyden, where he and his preach a ten years' homily to Calvinists, on breaches of the Sabbath, and sundry other "things amiss" in theology and morals. They receive "reproofs" and "reproaches" in

their turn. The prospect becomes wearisome, the neighborhood thorny, and they determine to go away.

This is the short, plain tale; and what does it say, but that they found it so difficult to agree with *any* body, that they were willing to risk the toils and perils of *any* distance, so they might not be contradicted with ease or safety? Wherein does it make their ambition to differ from theirs, who join house to house, and lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed ALONE in the midst of the earth? (Isa. v. 8.) All this, too, when in an official document to the commissioners of Charles II., they style themselves "voluntary exiles from our dear native country;"* and when the pleading Secretary frames "painfull" sentences to prove that the people of Holland did not drive them out, but they went of their own free choice and motion. Now, let us grant both statements. They were "voluntary exiles" from England: they left Holland of "their own free choice and motion." Still, can it be an astonishing riddle that England should help them to such volitions—nay, should have helped them therein somewhat impatiently; when they could not abide those who entertained "the same religious views," nor endure the company of Calvinists, who had so detested Arminianism as to cut off the head of one of its greatest advocates, and banish another from his native land? Was it an enigma, that England should not love those who could not love even their favorite Calvinism, when them selves could not control its destinies,† though Calvinism of

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, viii. 73.

† Master John Wilson's *dying* testimony was, that contempt of Puritan authority in Church and State might be the ruin of the country. It was in his view the crying sin of the times; unless their "luxury and sloth" were its equal.—Emerson's First Church, p. 104.

This is such sorry testimony, that Mr. Emerson would fain persuade us the Puritan patriarch was in his dotage. He seems to forget that he had just said, this testimony was drawn out of him by a crowd of friends,

such genuine virtue as to sacrifice men like Barnevelt and Grotius without a sigh? *

Pass we now from this, to the next advance in our Pilgrims' Progress, and let us imagine them, after leaving Prelatists and Calvinists alike behind, stepping out upon that memorable rock, which "as a beacon upon the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on an hill," marks the commencement of all Puritan story on this transatlantic soil. Their posterity hate saintly festivals and relics, by right of "uninterrupted succession." But they have nevertheless dignified the birth-day of this rock's Puritanic fame, as a day for something more substantial than red letters in a Calendar. They have given the rock itself more honor, than a Papist would confer upon a leg of St. Ignatius, or a Prelatist would accord to a consecrated church. They have not worshipped it, indeed; for a Papist never *worships* relics, he only bestows upon them "due honor and veneration."† But they have called it by a name, as sacred as might be given to the purest heart, which was ever a temple for the Holy Ghost. They have called it "SANCTIFIED!"‡ [74]

Now by the side of something thus exalted, beyond Pa-

[74] See Note 74.

---

because of his "unwavering faith and prophetic spirit." Wilson no doubt spoke out plainly, and without fear, because he was on his death-bed. And had his language but honored Puritanism, as much as it condemned it, instead of finding him set down as an old driveller, we should have seen him compared to Moses in the book of Deuteronomy: "His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." Poor Sir John, your honesty has robbed you of a splendid epitaph!—I say Sir John; for the Puritans, unable to call Paul and James, &c. by the name of *saint*, gave them the title of a *knight*. Thus Sir Paul, Sir James, &c. This was another of their ways to avoid Popery!—Maskell's Martin Mar-Prelate, pp. 175, 176.

* Watkins's Biog. Dict. p. 586. † Creed of Pope Pius IV

‡ See Boston Columbian Centinel for March 2, 1835.

pistical relics or Prelatical cathedrals, is the fit place to examine that wondrous piece of parchment, to which I have again and again referred, and on which Puritan hopes grounded as pertinacious and as just a claim, as that of papal Spaniards, when half the globe was given them by Heaven's Vicar for the whole. King James was no Pope, indeed, but sufficiently heaven's viceregent, when disposed, through his patent to the Plymouth Council, to sanction or connive at Puritan appetites for "the entire property" of that, which Ap. Laud said they had fallen quite in love with: I mean *the solid soil.** And here I cannot perhaps do better, than give Mr. Bancroft's version of this most comprehensive instrument; for he is a gentleman having an inkling for philosophic views and statesmanlike descriptions, and a devotee of sententious brevity.

The company in England with whom the Puritans had leagued themselves, under the ban of whose princely privileges they expected to grow from a mustard seed into "the greatest of trees," were incorporated as "The Council established at Plymouth, in the county of Devon, for the planting, ruling, ordering, and governing New England in America."† "The territory," says Mr. B., "conferred on the patentees in absolute property, with unlimited jurisdiction, the sole powers of legislation, the appointment of all officers and all forms of government, extended in breadth from the 40th to the 48th degree of north latitude, and in length from the Atlantic to the Pacific: that is to say, nearly all the inhabited British possessions in the north of the United States, all New England, New-York, half of New Jersey, very nearly all Pennsylvania, and the whole of the country to the west of these States, comprising, and at the time believed to comprise much more than a million of square miles, capable of sustaining far more than two hundred millions of inhabitants,

* Laud's Troubles, p. 142.

† Bancroft, i. 272.

were, by a single signature of King James, given away to a single corporation within the realm, composed of but forty individuals. The grant was absolute and exclusive; it conceded the land and the islands, the rivers and the harbors; the mines and the fisheries. Without the leave of the Council of Plymouth, not a ship might sail into a harbor from Newfoundland to the latitude of Philadelphia, not a skin might be purchased in the interior, not a fish might be caught on the coast, not an emigrant might tread the soil. * * * The patent left the emigrants at the mercy of the unrestrained power of the corporation; and it was under concessions from that plenary power, confirmed indeed by the English monarch, that institutions the most favorable to *colonial liberty* were established." This last hint is corroborated, by Mr. Graham, in respect to King Charles I. also. "It is indeed a strange coincidence, that this arbitrary prince, at the very time he was exercising the sternest despotism over the royalists in Virginia, should have been cherishing the principles of liberty in New England."*

It may appear somewhat singular, that such an instrument could ever have been obtained from any monarch. But there were conspiring causes, which influenced the "especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion" of the royal mind. Noble dependents were to be provided for. Flatterers were to be rewarded. Complainants wanted hush-money. Merchants desired encouragement. Commerce sought for guidance, adventure, and protection. And lastly, "and which was not the least," as the Plymouth Secretary phrases it, the turbulent might be removed, and vent their spleen where its nitric fumes might be less corrosive, or spend themselves like a bomb-shell bursting in upper air. The king promised to connive at even their Puritanism, "provided they behaved peaceably;"† a tole-

* North America, i. 260. Compare Burk's Virginia, ii. 8.

† Belknap's Biog. i. 365.—Chalmers' Annals, pp. 85, 86.

rable proof, by the way, that at home they had behaved in any manner but a peaceable one, under the influence of that ecclesiastical system. There were Puritans among the high and the mighty, ("people of distinguished family and fortune," as Mr. Graham calls them, N. America i. 257,) who, whether for political, commercial, or religious reasons, labored to advance the views of their humbler brethren—humbler I mean in rank or opulence. Beyond a question, they knew the hazard of the game they played at, and were not a little anxious to secure some distant place of refuge, should their hopes be blown and lost. Says the author of European settlements in America, (ii. 140,) "This colony [Plymouth] received its *principal* assistance from the discontent of several *great men* of the Puritan party, who were its protectors, and who entertained a design of settling among them in New England, if they should fail in the measures they were pursuing, for establishing the liberty and reforming the religion of their mother country"*—establishing a liberty and religion, our author might have added, which made even Presbyterians groan! The celebrated Presbyterian, Walker, called the reign of such liberty and religion, "The English Anarchy."† These various causes and interests, combined and operating, hatched a golden egg, which no one of them alone could perhaps have brought to light.

And yet so strange, so wayward is human nature, that while the Puritans wanted all the benefits which Charters would convey, they were nevertheless, (though at the hazard of sawing off the limb between themselves and the tree,) sorely tempted to dispute a *king's* right to grant them. The House of Commons, where there were men who looked

* Dr. Morse endorses this. Geography, p. 157. ed. 1792.—Raynal does also. West Indies, v. 180.—See also Note 75.

† Biog. Universelle, vol. 50, p. 85.

anxiously to New England as a dernier resort, summoned Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the President of the Plymouth Council, and required him to deliver up his Patent, because forsooth it was a king's monopoly !* How completely this illustrates their ungracious demeanor towards royalty. They would cut off the hand that blessed them, if it was linked to a royal shoulder.† O, if Charles II., when he ordered the writ of *quo warranto* to be issued against the Government of Massachusetts, had quoted from the Journal of a Puritan House of Commons, and told them they were a monopoly, built up by royal hands, he might have made his court ring with louder laughter, than when the bribe of 2000 guineas was unfortunately published.‡ But Charles resorted to other arguments ; and the one about a monopoly was left for them to employ, with as much effect, and as little consistency, as often marked their purposes. They wearied out the Plymouth Company, when they had obtained a better means of accomplishing their aims ; to wit, a Charter for their own private use. The Plymouth Company worn down with opposition, gave up their Patent of their own accord ; but the Puritans clung to the Charter over which they exercised entire control, as the body clings to the spirit—to the latest gasp.

But I am insensibly, and almost unavoidably, anticipat-

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 66, 67. Belknap's Biog. i. 369. Pownall on the Colonies, pp. 48, 49, fourth edition.

† The Episcopal king granted, but the Puritan House would *not*, the right of self-taxation—the very thing our fathers of '76 fought and bled for !—Chalmers' Revolt of the Colonies, i. 35. We see, then, to whom the necessity for a Revolution in '76, may ultimately be traced. Had the Puritans permitted the king to make his grants of self-taxation unrebuked, a precedent would have been established, which would have made a Revolution and a civil war needless. While the men whose forefathers would not prevent such awful consequences, are the very men who now ascribe those consequences to Episcopacy !

‡ Chalmers, p. 413.

ing; the portions of this history so run together. While the Plymouth Patent was the best which offered, the Puritans were by no means backward to make the most of it; monopoly though it were, and "a grievance of the Commonwealth." The story usually told, of course is, that the proposition to avail themselves of the shelter and privileges of the Plymouth Council came from themselves—that the Leyden Puritans, *e. g.* first resolved to abandon Holland, of "their own free choice and motion." But Sir Ferdinando Gorges, who was under no temptation to misstate, and whom the House of Commons pronounced "a gentleman of honor and worth,"* presents us with a very different tale. He says that the Virginia Company, being somewhat straitened in their means, were advised to make offers † to the Puritans in Holland; who if they had "such freedom and liberty as might stand with their likings," would work cheaper for them than others. He says that the Puritans closed with these offers, and sailed for New England; where finding "that the authority they had from the Company of Virginia could not warrant their abode," they applied to him.

The current version of their romance also is, that their sufferings in New England were almost intolerable. But Gorges declares, that they found the country "so prosperous and pleasing to them, they hastened away their ship with order to their Solicitor to deal with" him, "to be a means they might have a grant from the Council of New England's affairs to settle in the place; which was accordingly performed to their particular satisfaction, and good content of them all."‡

This account mars the poetry and sinks the pathos of

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 66, 67. Belknap's Biog. i. 370.

† "To draw" others, and not "to be drawn" themselves, is the language of Gorges.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 73.

‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 73.

the scheme for leaving Holland; but it is too simple, sensible, self-consistent, and disinterested, to be otherwise than true. I must accept it, and represent the plan for departure from the "sweet liberties" of a Calvinistic territory, as one suggested by a company of mercantile adventurers; who, on the one hand, would indulge tender consciences, if, on the other hand, the possessors of those consciences would do their best to replenish said company's exhausted coffers. This plan was originated by mercantile speculators, and was entered into as a mercantile compact; in which "such freedom and liberty as might stand with" the "likings" of one of the contracting parties, was specified as an actual consideration, along with grosser matters of per centage, ships, and trade. Puritan fancy, Puritan rhymes, Puritan orators, and Puritan historians, may put a fairer and more spiritual representation upon these unpoetic facts. But the plain, unvarnished statements of Gorges, will always look a hundred-fold more like the naked, natural truth.*

There is another point brought plainly out by the narrative of Gorges, and which should be particularly observed. I believe it is not an uncommon thing for the readers of Puritan history, who would throw as much as possible of the halo of romance about it, to confound the connexion of the Puritans with the Virginia Company and the Plymouth Council, and to transfer all the hardness of their bargain with the former, to their patent under the latter. Their bargain with the Virginia Company was a close one; for as Gorges ,testifies the funds of the company were low, and they were obliged to count their coppers. "The terms of the contract," says Mr. Bancroft, "were deemed exceedingly severe."† And the impositions of the contract, if

* Even Hutchinson admits a strong doubt about religion's concern in "the settlement" of North America. He ascribes its "*present* flourishing state" to that cause.—Hutch. Hist. i. 11.

† Bancroft, i. 305.

they were such, if they submitted to them blindly, have been "aggravated when convenient;" as Baxter, in his Reformed Liturgy, (p. 64,) actually allows a minister to do with the sins of the impenitent. One would think, that the iron of feudal bondage was all the while entering into their souls. But the exact truth is, as Gorges states, that their fealty to the Virginia Company was of short duration; for finding, or suspecting themselves to be out of its jurisdiction, and of course out of its protection, they forthwith applied to him, as the head of the Plymouth Council, to be brought under the wing of a better corporation. Their wishes were complied with, to the "particular satisfaction and good content of them all." And even Mr. Bancroft is constrained to admit, that their agent in London "obtained from the Council of Plymouth, concessions equal to all his desires."*

How worse than idle then, how unfair, and how untrue, to represent them as distressed by a bargain, in which they were not the applicants but the applied-to; and that they wrung hard concessions from those, who took advantage of their needs, instead of being themselves, by "their own free choice and motion," the accepters of a scheme and terms, proposed to them by a mercantile association! And how still more destitute of truth and fairness, the picture, which represents them grinding in such a sort of prison-mill, as that at which poor Gorton labored;† when lo! they were soon situated under better auspices, to the particular satisfaction and good content of every soul among them, with all their desires responded to. Trahit sua quemque voluptas: if such a situation could not please them, where could they have found one, in which contentment would have seen them professedly more true disciples?

* Bancroft, i. 320.

† Spark's American Biography, 2d series, v. 364.

And much poetry and rhetoric too is often wasted upon the sufferings, which the Puritans at first endured from the inhospitable soil and clime of young New England. Many a sentimental eye sees nothing but parched corn upon their table, and an avalanche of snow upon their roof.[76] Gorges admits, that when they landed at Plymouth many of them were weak and feeble. "But," he goes on to say, "they were not many days ashore, before they had gotten both health and strength, through the comfort of the air, the store of fish and fowl, with plenty of wholesome roots and herbs the country afforded; besides the civil respect the natives used towards them, tending much to their happiness in so great extremity they were in."* And to this the Puritan historian Trumbull fully agrees. "In New England, Providence had prepared the way for their settlement. The uncommon mortality in 1617 had in a manner depopulated that part of the country, in which they began their plantation. They found fields which had been planted, without owners, and a fine country round them, in some measure cultivated, without an inhabitant."†

It will be supposed, no doubt, that the attractions of this "fine country" were utterly unknown and unthought-of, by the humble-minded Puritans. But this could hardly be. Captain Smith's description of New England, where he displayed upon his very title-page "the proofe of the present benefit this country affoords; whither, this present yeare 1616, eight voluntary Ships are gone to make further tryale," was published no less than four years before the ex-

[76] See Note 76.

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 73.

† Trumbull's United States, p. 72.—So says Gov. Winthrop, in a letter to his son in England. "Here can be no want of any thing, to those who bring means to raise out of the earth and sea."—He, too, would tempt the rich.—Savage's Wint. i. 375.

pedition in the Mayflower.* And Smith himself was not unknown to the adventurers from Leyden. He would have sailed with them to Plymouth, and might have been of immense service to them, if they would have recompensed his personal experience and ingenuity. But the Pilgrims preferred his books and maps to his more costly self; because, as he says in his quaint way, they were "much better cheap." No wonder he should add somewhat of a philosophic comment on their penuriousness. "Many other have used the like good husbandry, that have payed soundly in trying their self-willed conclusions."†

That New England soon became in Puritanic eyes an El Dorado, however some may suppose it was at first contemplated but as a mere place of refuge from the storms of persecution, is amply evident from the fact, that emigration to it became such a perfect tide, that it was checked by Government.‡ But this, in Puritan historians, is no proof that New England was becoming a most desirable abode; it only evinces another burst of hostility on the part of Prelatical authorities. But how, or why, should a Government which all along had countenanced their going, at last arrest it? because of their hatred of their faith, and desire to have them longer within reach of persecution's fangs? So multitudes would say, and spontaneously believe. But let us hear the uncommitted Gorges, on this delicate subject. "The reason of that restraint," he affirms, "was grounded upon the several complaints that came out of those parts, of the divers sects and schisms that were amongst them all, contemning the public government of the ecclesiastical state. And it was doubted that they would, in short time, wholly shake off the royal jurisdiction of the Sovereign

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 95.

† Smith's Gen. Hist. ii. 263.

‡ Europ. Sett. ii. 140, 141.—"The passion for land" became a perfect epidemic.—Bancroft's United States, i. 328.

Magistrate."* And what then was the protection that England assumed to herself, in such threatening circumstances—circumstances which the after history of Massachusetts more and more developed? This, says Gorges, on the page just quoted: She insisted none should go, until they had taken "the oaths of supremacy and allegiance." But this the Puritans would not consent to.[77] They would sooner desert the realm, by stealth or violence. They might go scot-free with their religion, if they would swear to be loyal to their lawful Sovereign. But that they obstinately refused to do. And what does this prove, but what has been proved before, that their cavils and clamors were political rather than religious—that they wanted not the Government's tolerance, but the Government itself. And as they could not obtain their foremost aim, they wanted the privilege of establishing their economy on the "outside of the world," as they expressed it,† so it might be out of "view" and beyond "reach." "You may have your way," says an accommodating King, "provided you will not use your power against myself, but will still be loyal to authority at home." "No," is the virtual answer, "we will run the gauntlet first, and owe you no allegiance we can possibly avoid." "Then," the reply is, "I will stop you if I can."[78] And this is persecution—persecution to the uttermost;‡ and the men who suffer it are, (when they are supplicating for a charter,) are terribly afraid they shall "lose their interest in the English nation—they being desirous rather to enlarge his Majesty's dominions, and to live under their natural Prince!"

Well, we have the major portion of the Leyden congre-

[77] See Note 77. [78] See Note 78.

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 80–82. Belknap's Biography, i. 381.—Compare Chalmers' Revolt of the Col. i. 44, 45.

† Hutchinson, i. 448. ‡ Neal's New England, i. 151.

gation established around Plymouth Bay at last: whether the whole came over, Dr. Morse says must remain uncertain.* But as the advocates of Puritanic exclusive privileges would fain incline us to believe, they were destined to be disturbed afresh by Prelatic neighbors. The Plymouth Council gave a patent to a son of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, in 1633, for a tract on Massachusetts Bay. This gentleman was appointed Lieutenant-General of New England; and with him came one William Morrell, an Episcopalian in holy orders, who was to be his compeer in the Church! This was an ominous step indeed. But (a most singular fact!) it was the nearest approach to an *English* bishopric, which this country was ever destined to behold. The settlement of Gorges did not succeed,† and Morrell never assumed any powers which might have been intrusted to him: in fact, was so modest and so prudent, that though he resided in New England above a year, he never mentioned his intended character, till just before his departure to his native land.‡ He left behind him a poem on New England, in Latin and English, which may be found in the Massachusetts Historical Collections, at the reference just given. And thus ended an expedition which was looked upon by many, as likely to bring with it Star Chambers, High Commissions, and Archbishops. It did not vaunt itself; and so Mr. Bancroft permits it to depart with a quiet sneer. "They came to plant a hierarchy and a General Government, and they produced only a fruitless

* Geography, p. 157.

† Gorges himself tells us why. Because the Puritans at Plymouth, hearing he was in trouble at home, drew off from his son, and left him "disabled to do any thing to purpose."—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vi. 74.

‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, i. 125. Davis's Morton, p. 109. Baylies' Plym. i. 125.

quarrel and a dull poem."* It was unquestionably better, however, for Episcopacy to end its attempts in that "dull" way, than to write its temper, as Draco and as Puritanism wrote their laws and deeds, in characters of blood. What would not Gov. Winthrop have given, in those final hours when he bitterly repented having been the instrument of Puritan cruelty,† if he had only had such a stupid crime to answer for!

There is nothing further for me particularly to allude to at this period of the history of New England; and I will here bid Plymouth farewell, and turn to the Charters of Massachusetts. Before doing so, however, I cheerfully quote a compliment from Dr. Morse, that, "However rigid the New Plymouth colonists may have been, at their first separation from the Church of England, yet they never discovered that persecuting spirit which we have seen in Massachusetts."‡ And sorry am I to find, that Massachusetts should have so little respected Plymouth, as to keep it in perpetual awe, and make one of the disturbers of its peace a member of its General Court, because he was "a daring trader among the Indians."§ Massachusetts, as we know, finally swallowed Plymouth up alive, and she became but one of her fourteen counties; pretty much as she remains at the present day. When the deed was done, and Plymouth ceased to be a separate colony in 1691, her agent in England could not refrain from bitter objurgation. He thus wrote home to the last Governor. "All the frame of heaven

* Bancroft, i. 326.—Belknap, however, compliments Morrell. Perhaps because he did not turn out an Archbishop Laud. Biog. i. 368.

† Belknap's Biog. ii. 356. Savage's Wint. ii. 174.

‡ Geog. p. 156.—Compare Chalmers' Annals, p. 97.—Morse doubtless had Chalmers' testimony in his eye; but, *ut modo*, he mollifies it. For example, Chalmers does not say "never discovered," but "seldom discovered."

§ Baylies' Plymouth, Pt. i. pp. 132, 133, 217, and notes.

moves on one axis, and the whole of New England's interest seems designed to be loaden on one bottom, and her particular motions to concentrate to the Massachusetts tropic."*

Come we now to that ascendant Colony, which impressed multitudes about its designs upon New England, as Cæsar impressed Cato about his designs upon the world. On the 4th of March, A. D. 1629, King Charles I. granted a Charter to certain individuals, styled "the Company of Massachusetts Bay." And this charter, when it had been vacated under a writ of *quo warranto*, on the 18th of June, 1684, was followed by another from William and Mary, on the 7th of October, 1691. Thus a charter, and a royal charter, with the stamp of monopoly and popular grievance on its front, is, notwithstanding, you see, the banner under which, sooner than live in such a place as Holland, with its freedom for conscience and the austerest Calvinism, anti-monarchists and anti-Churchmen are content to sail.

And, what is singular indeed, they loved such charters better, absolutely better, than the tender mercies of a Puritanic Parliament. In the days of the Commonwealth, in 1651, there was a rumor that their royal charter would be taken from them.† Thereupon a long, circuitous, and most peculiar address was forwarded to Parliament; in which, lest it appear that the Colony had been a charge at its foundation to the parent country, they represent themselves as having left home rich, and spent money freely: in which again, lest they appear rich now, and thus become a mark for political cupidity, they represent themselves as living in "a mean and low condition;" and in which, finally, so much greater is their fear of republicans than of a monarch, they importunately supplicate that "it shall go no worse with them than it did under the late King." The document may be found

* Baylies' Plymouth, Pt. iv. p. 138.

† The address, or petition, itself shows this.

in the appendix to Hutchinson's first volume of his history, and is altogether one of the most unique specimens of Puritanic logic, and Puritanic love of gain and power, which can any where be found.

The tyrannical patronage of *one* monarch rather than a *hundred*, is then that which suits the preferences of Puritans. Under this they feel safe in attempting to erect a new political constitution, which, according to the terms of the old oath, they might "beautify with their presence." There was no hope for independence under a Parliament. There was such hope under a King—a hope which was ultimately fruition. No wonder they loved royal charters so dearly, when not called to discuss their merits in a House of Commons, but to enjoy their privileges in a house exclusively their own. Bad, then, as Kings are, Protestant Episcopal ones are useful for some purposes. Independence may, in in some way or other, be gleaned out of their charters. But Puritan Parliaments and Popish Kings are utterly impracticable: they offer not a hook to hang a hope on. We have seen how the Puritans dreaded their own Parliament, in the document from Hutchinson's appendix. A document in the same appendix will show, how they dreaded Oliver Cromwell also, who had formed a strange plan for having some of them, as they express it, "transplanted into Ireland." And now, as neither Parliaments nor my Lord Protector give them any satisfaction, let us suppose them Huguenots, who had felt the weight of a hand, that could destroy so solemn an edict as that of Nantes with a single blow. What could they have acquired at the foot of the throne of the "Grand Monarque?" Firebrands, arrows, and death, would have been their answer, for supplications in behalf of conscience there.*

But charters can be obtained from a Protestant Episco-

* Miller's Phil. of Hist. iv. 104, shows how the losses of the Huguenots were indirectly a great gain to the Puritans.

pal monarch one of which could be cherished "as the most precious boon,"* and a second hailed "almost as another *magna charta* of liberty."† And still such a monarch is stigmatized, as no better than a Papist himself, as a ruthless oppressor of consciences, and a foe to the liberties of his subjects. Sooner than take an oath of allegiance to him, they will fly from their native land, like deserters, to "the outside of the world."

Can we not now see, how much of truth there is, and how much of *ad captandum* declamation, in the flings of Puritans at Churchmen, with a king as their civil head, denouncing them as "mere formalists, angry bigots, fiery zealots, sons of violence, furious persecutors, Popishly affected, haters of godliness and godly men?"‡ Is it not a part of a Puritan's destiny to vituperate prelatical England? have not the Fates ordained him to it? He can take a charter from her, indeed, and like the buyer in the market say, (Prov. xx. 14,) It is naught, it is naught. It is a stark monopoly, and a grievance to the Commonwealth for a king (one man) to be so lavish of exclusive privileges. But when he is gone his way, then he boasteth: his berated parchment becomes a most precious boon, and an almost *magna charta* of liberty. He sees in all its pages, but one feature against which he can with the slightest consistency murmur, and that is an exception of Papists from toleration. This was found in the Charter of William and Mary, while that of Charles was silent upon the subject of religious privileges. Of course he preferred that; for then he could deal with religion as he pleased, and tolerate nobody: moreover, that Charter had no such uncomfortable injunctions, as the

* Bancroft, i 342.

† Story's Misc. p. 64.—Compare Mather's Life of Phips, p. 63. Hutch. Hist. iii. 84.

‡ White's Letters to Dissenters, i. 8.

new one, about oaths to Government;* and thus allowed him (as he understood it) to pay allegiance to no one but himself. Still, King William's Charter was no mean one for civil privileges; and it was taken, as the issue shows, with a determination to abide by it, in all which gratified his ambition, or promoted his worldly interests, and to treat it as a dead letter, when its injunctions did not please. For example, more than thirty years before, had King Charles II. issued a mandamus to save Quakers from the gallows; and the new Charter tolerated every body but a Papist. Yet in 1694, a man who wrote a Quaker pamphlet, was imprisoned for nearly a whole year, and all his books, which the sheriff could lay his hands on, committed to the flames.† And ten years later, 1704, I find the Quakers importuning the Dissenters in England, to remonstrate with their brethren in New England, against the unrepealed laws which bore upon them with extreme severity. A letter was written, at their request, to show the Government at home that Dissenters *there* would not deny to one another, what they claimed for their particular party! ‡

Such did the Puritans continue to be, under a Charter which pledged all but unbounded toleration. As to the times of the old Charter, especially from 1640 to 1660, when, says Hutchinson,§ Massachusetts "approached very near to an independent commonwealth," and threw off all disguises—the days of Endicott's chief glory—no language could more truly describe their temper, than that of the author, or authors,|| of "European Settlements." "The very doctrine of any sort of toleration was so odious to the great-

* The old charter empowered, but did not require, the administration of such oaths; because it was intended for a Company who were to stay in England, and not run away from it —See Bancroft, i. 343.

† Felt's Annals of Salem, pp. 323, 325.

‡ Calamy's Life of Baxter abridged, i. 670.

§ Hist. ii. 10. || London Gallery of Portraits, iii. 34.

est part, that one of the first persecutions set up here was against a small party, who were hardy enough to maintain that the civil magistrate had no lawful power, to use compulsory measures in affairs of religion."*

And yet, these most reluctant yielders to toleration, who kept the scorpion whip of persecution lying by their sides, when they dare no longer use it, are, we are told, among persecution's most blameless victims. They are those "favorites with heaven," about the "severe virtue" "of whose rude intolerance, the world has been filled with malignant calumnies."† They are those moderate exclusives, whose "transient persecutions" "in self-defence" "were no more than a train of mists, hovering of an autumn morning over the channel of a fine river, that diffused freshness and fertility wherever it wound."‡

The Huguenots, says Mr. Smedley in one of his interesting and able volumes,§ exhibited "the most unresisting patience," beneath a system which would have dragooned them into Popery. But they might as well have looked for water "from the rock of flint," as hoped for a drop of mercy to put out the well-fed fires, beneath which they and their possessions vanished like smoke away. The Puritans were as unruly and libellous, as fiery blood and unbridled tongues could make them.|| But they obtained privileges, securing to them all the rights, comforts, immunities and hopes, with which social safety, and nearly entire political independence, could enrich them. The only ugly and provoking page in a charter, "almost a *magna charta* of liberty," was one authorizing a partial toleration;¶ and that,

* Eur. Sett. ii. 143.

† Bancroft, i. 348.

‡ Bancroft, i. 463.

§ Eng. edit. iii. 256.

|| The Calvinists of Zurich called them "vain brawlers." Compare Epistle to Titus, iii. 2.—Zurich Letters, p. 364.

¶ They thus speak of those who advocated toleration in New Eng-

but for other pages of antidote, and the power of putting it to sleep, they would willingly have treated as Jehudi did the prophet's scroll. (Jeremiah xxxvi. 23.)

But notwithstanding the tale goes round and round, as true in its cycles as frosts and comets, that they were the meek, unpitied victims of a stony persecution, that all but ground them into powder. Their requiem is chanted as formally as if, like Popish masses, it could shorten the purgation of the dead. Their acclaim is made to swell and soar, as if listening angels would lean from from the skies to hear it. The very spot which *their* feet first touched, is contemplated with a reverence not surpassed by that of Mohammedans for the "black stone," brought by Gabriel to Abraham, and on which the Father of the Faithful "left the print of *his* feet."* This spot is enclosed from all rude and ignoble treading,† and is to be guarded with due sectarian vigilance, to all future time; and this by the descendents of men, who broke down the carved work of Episcopal temples with axes and hammers.‡ (Ps. lxxiv. 6.) And the text to which I have gone for its *terms*, they would have gone to for *authority*, to justify their ruthless demolition. Nor is that all. A chip of Plymouth's "sanctified rock" is as necessary a relic, for the consecration of a "Church of the Pilgrims," as the bones of an apostle for St. Peter's at Rome. Godwin, the infidel, and who wrote an essay on sepul-

land: "buzzing our people in the ear, with a thing they call liberty." Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, iv. 21.

* Ch. Butler's Hor. Bib. p. 215.

† I did not speak of the iron railing, &c., *around* the Rock, when speaking of the trident *over* it. It would be horrible, however, for a Papist to put a railing around the shrine of *his* devotion.

‡ See Mercurius Rusticus by Ryves, ed. 1685. Pt. ii. 116–163, for facts; some almost too enormous to be credible.—That, however, was not the worst of Puritan fury; sacrilege was defended upon principle! See Gauden's answer to its *pleas*.—Tears and Sighs of the Church of England, book iii. chaps. 20, 23.

chres to procure honor for the illustrious dead—an essay he feared his name would injure—would encounter no rebuke, if he spent a fortune on a Mount Auburn, to procure repose for Puritan ashes. The *fiat* seems to have issued forth, that as the place where Puritan feet first rested, shall be evermore "sanctified," so shall Puritan memory be evermore glorified. And all this, too, comes from the "High Commission Court" of those, who detest the "man-worship" of the servile Prelatist, and account the rites and ceremonies of even *Protestant* Episcopacy an object for ridicule, it matters not how reckless, if "well-conducted." "We do not hesitate," says the editor of the Andover Review, "to avow the belief, that well-conducted ridicule is a proper, and will be a most useful weapon, against the claims of Episcopacy." And what is one of the first and foremost things, on which this "well-conducted ridicule" is made to pounce? On the habit of bowing the head and offering a silent prayer, just after entering the house of God. O tempora! O mores! and would it then be better to be listless and irreverent? But let us not argue; it is better to condemn such a censor out of his own brethren's mouth. It is the custom of the Calvinists at Zurich, the Calvinists of Zuingle's tutoring, who would agree with such a censor in one of his most favorite theories, (that which depreciates the Eucharist to an office as low as that of a Papal picture,) —it is the custom of such model Calvinists, to do precisely this same ridiculous thing!*

And is there no appeal from the wilfulness of those, who poured abuse upon our fathers, and whose children are solemnly taught to turn even our devotions into ridicule? Is there no hope for the reaction of honor or justice? Fearfully not. We have waited for the returning tide of charity and wisdom—for the sanative balm of time—"more

* Turner's Hist. of all Religions, edit. 1695, pp. 280, 282, 289.

than they that watch for the morning—I say more than they that watch for the morning." Still they come not. We may have the word "Protestant" over our doors, as the first Church of Trinity Parish, in New York, had,* we may stamp it on our Prayer Book; but it will read to many eyes nothing but "Papist." Our clergy may one and all say, as solemnly and as vehemently as the calumniated Montague, "I call God and all his holy angels to witness, I nor am, nor have been, nor intend to be hereafter, either Papist, or Romish Catholic, a Papist of State or of Religion; but a priest, a member, a follower, of the Church and Doctrine of the Church of England."† Still, and on our oath, we are Protestants in vain. We are believers in "The Holy Catholic ‡ Church," and therefore, inevitably, Catholics after the fashion of Rome; though Rome be, as she is, the worst enemy of true Catholicity it ever had: since, but for Rome, Catholicity would have come down to us pure. So Catholic and Papist are, to Puritan eyes, all one; and he who dares to say this is a profound blunder, and that a genuine Puritan is nearer a Papist than a genuine Catholic, "is condemned already."§ He is consigned to the pains

* Smith's New-York, 4to, p. 190.

† Appeal, pp. 110, 111, edit. 1625.

‡ The squeamishness of some about the word "Catholic," is even ridiculous. If we are to reject so good a word, because Papists please to appropriate it, we must give up "Church," and "Bishop;" and say, with an old version, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my *congregation*;" or, as one wished to translate 1 Peter, ii. 25, "the Shepherd and *Presbyterian* of our souls."—To all such over-sensitiveness I know no better reply than King James's to Dr. Rainolds, at Hampton Court; who was for giving up this, that, and the other thing, simply because the Papists had the same. "Doctor," said the king, "do you mean to go barefoot, because the Papists wear shoes and stockings?"

Upon the change of "congregation" for "church," there are some interesting remarks in Skinner's Truth and Order, pp. 130, 131. Swords' ed.

§ Doubtless that was one ground of Bishop Montague's condemnation, for he said so. (Appeal, p. 112.) He said, too, what we often see

and penalties of an uncharitableness, bleak as the shore, rocky as the soil, and enduring as the granite of Plymouth.* The writer of these lines will undoubtedly be esteemed an arch-heretic, for his presumptuous questioning of opinions, which have become as well-known fixtures as the hills of New England. Had he lived in the days of John Endicott, he could hardly have hoped for so soft a death, as being smothered in one of the "autumnal mists" of the imaginative Mr. Bancroft. He would have been driven into the wilderness like Upshal and Williams, manacled and made a menial like Gorton and his associates, or left to swing upon a scaffold with Marmaduke Stephenson and Mary Dyar.

LETTER VIII.

I HAVE given, in my former letters, what my readers may consider sufficient, (to use one of our German-English words,) for an *excursus* on the question, Why did the Puritans leave Europe? How far "a purely religious cause" influenced them, and how far the love of power, notoriety,

now, that the lowest churchmen, when they turn, make the worst high churchmen, and are most apt to become Papists in the end.

* Such outrageously partial judgment was severely condemned, by even so loose a moralist as Montaigne. I commend his counsel to those who are so fond of proscribing Churchmen by the wholesale. "I am a mortal enemy to this vicious form of censure; He is of the League, because he admires the Duke of Guise; he is astonished at the King of Navarre's valor and diligence, and therefore he is a Huguenot; he finds such and such faults in the King's manners and conduct, and therefore he is seditious in his heart."—Montaigne's Essays, book iii. chap. 10.

or trade, of an enlargement of his Majesty's dominions, or, as Mr. Bancroft semi-poetically has it, "the passion for land,"* was mingled up with such a cause, qualified or superseded it, authorities enough have probably been furnished, for those who are willing to examine both sides of a debated question. If any of them can arrive at the comfortable conclusion of Mr. Minot, one of the historians of Massachusetts, and announce, with his placid assurance, that it was not "derogatory to the principles of their emigration to entertain a hope, that while the cause of religion was served with so much hazard, success might also attend an honest attempt at husbandry and traffic,"† I will not wage war with their reasoning, nor with its comforts, but—leave them alone with their glory. Some might hint, to be sure, that an inference like Mr. Minot's is slightly tinctured with the doctrine of *merit*, as it seems to intimate that the Puritans deserved, if they did not expect, plentiful gains in commerce, through their toils and losses for religion. If it do, that would not frighten me; for after sundry stares, exclamations, and surprises, it has at length been ascertained, that Puritanism and Popery are nearer of kin than the theory and practice of Calvinistic toleration, or the theory and practice of Socinian liberality. The one takes to itself merit, from its wearing shirts of horse-hair; the other, from lavish self-abuse of its unfortunate human nature:—the one superstitiously reverences rites and ceremonies; the other, superstitiously dreads them:—the one is infallibly right, in abetting the supremacy of St. Peter's chair; the other, the supremacy of the congregational platform:—the one claims

* This passion, Roger Williams said, was "one of the gods of New England." Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, i. 279.—Dissenters, as Mr. White says, have complained that nonconformity was a money-losing speculation. He shows the contrary.—White's Letters to Towgood, 2d ed. 1745, p. 10, &c.

† Minot's Mass. i. 14, 15.

distant countries, through Father Pope; the other, through Father Adam:*—the one thinks it right to terrify or subjugate heretics by the penalties of the sword; and to this, the other, though usually averse to responses, accords a long and loud *Amen.*

Specimens of this last point of consanguinity it is now proposed to exhibit; and in this letter, with particular reference to the treatment manifested by Puritans, towards those from whose immediate society they had torn themselves—*members of the Church of England.*

In order to arrive at that just point of observation, and properly attempered sensibility, which will enable us to appreciate facts under this head, it will be necessary, as a preliminary, to show what feelings the Puritans *professed*—may I not say actually entertained?—toward the Church of England, how they practically regarded things, which to her were as the signet on her right hand, the ordinations of her ministers, and their administration of sacraments.

The Rev. Francis Higginson, one of the earliest Puritan ministers of Salem, Mass., was once a clergyman of the Established Church, at Leicester in England. He left England, because too much respect was demanded of him for its Establishment; but his name became famous for the respect it afterwards demanded for the Establishment of Massachusetts. He died in 1630; but his son and successor John, who as one of "the seven pillars,"† or as a preacher, was seventy-two years in office, and who lived till 1708, supported Puritan dignity with an energy, which the father thought a most grievous intolerance in an ecclesiastical

* Hutch. Collect. p. 27. Reason sixth for Emigration.

† "The idea of "seven pillars" to a congregation seems to have come from Prov. ix. 1. A text of Scripture for Congregationalism, even from the Old Testament; while for poor Episcopacy, there was none even in the New!

court beyond the seas.* The defamers of his clerical vocation were whipped and fined, with summary justice, and he could not walk to his meeting-house without a sexton paraded by his side—an exaction which I cannot find authorized by Gibson's ponderous Codex, or alluded to, as desirable, among the multitudinous wants enumerated by Stackhouse in his "Miseries of the Clergy."†

Such was the disposition of the Higginsons, for concessions to their Puritan prejudices; yet the father of the race could make none to a Church in which he had been reared and tutored, and at whose altars he had pronounced the most solemn vows of fealty.‡ Still, when embarked on board "the good and strong ship" Talbot, with five and twenty cannon to support his new pretensions, and "all manner of munition and provision for the plantation for a twelve-month,"§ he could not abandon Britain rudely.|| As he saw the white cliffs of that father-land sinking beneath the horizon, (to him forever,) his natural feelings, with perhaps some qualms of compunction, rose within his bosom. He called, (so says Mr. Noah Hobart, in addressing "the members of the Episcopal Separation,") he called "his children and the other passengers¶ to the stern of the ship, to take their last sight of their native country, and made this speech to them; 'We will not say, as the Separatists were wont to

* John boasted that he was "acknowledged to be a member of the purest church in Salem."—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vii. 222.—So the Puritans could depreciate the purity of one another, to exalt their own.

† Felt's Annals of Salem, pp. 236, 243, 246.

‡ "At first he was a strict Episcopalian." Felt's Salem, p. 42.—Magnalia, i. 323.

§ The *fleet* had 80 guns, with stores of arms and powder, drums and colors, &c. &c. Oldmixon, i. 58.

|| Hutchinson's Collect. p. 32.

¶ The ship had about a hundred planters on board. The authority does not say how many women and children. Hutchinson's Collect. p. 32.

say, at their leaving England, Farewell Babylon! Farewell Rome! But we will say, Farewell dear England! Farewell the Church of God in England, and all the Christian friends there! We do not go to New England, as Separatists from the Church of England, though we cannot but separate from the corruptions of it; but we go to practice the positive part of Church Reformation in America."* Hobart does not quote this sentence from Cotton Mather with precision; neither does Mr. Allen, in his Biographical Dictionary. Hobart says not a word about "the propagation of the Gospel," which was another of the objects named; and he takes good care to forget, as Mr. Felt does,† that "he concluded with a fervent prayer for the king, and church, and state in England."‡

This was in April, 1629. A year afterward, there was another embarkation. On the eve of sailing, a large party addressed a most singular letter § "to the rest of their brethren in and of the Church of England." They took care to have it published "a few days after their embarkation."|| It is too long for entire quotation, and so I content myself with one of its most striking passages. In modern orthography, it runs as follows:

"We desire you would be pleased to take notice of the principals and body of our company, as those who esteem it our honor to call THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, from whence we rise, OUR DEAR MOTHER; and cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; ever acknow-

* N. Hobart's Sec. Address, pp. 90, 91. † Annals of Salem, p. 44.

‡ Magnalia, i. 328.

§ The Massachusetts Company held their last meeting on board the fleet, and issued this letter for the Puritans, "for the preventing of misconstructions." The Puritans, meanwhile, were *secretly* carrying off the Charter!—Chalmers' Rev. of the Col. i. 44.

|| Neal's New England, i. 132.

ledging, that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation, we have received in her bosom, and sucked it from her breasts. We leave it not, therefore, as loathing that milk wherewith we were nourished there, but, blessing God for the parentage and education, as members of the same body, shall always rejoice in her good, and unfeignedly grieve for any sorrow that shall ever betide her; and while we have breath sincerely desire and endeavor the continuance and abundance of her welfare, with the enlargement of her bounds in the kingdom of Christ Jesus." Further on the letter entreats that they may not be despised nor deserted "in their prayers and affections."*

This letter is dated, April 7, 1630, from Yarmouth, aboard the Arabella, or Arbella, and forms No. I. of the appendix, of the first volume, of Hutchinson's History of Massachusetts. No wonder Cotton Mather should say of it, when attempting its elaborate defence, "if it now puzzle the reader, to reconcile these passages with the principles declared, the practices followed, and the persecutions undergone, [inflicted, rather,] by these American Reformers."† Gov. Hutchinson's historical comment is, "This paper has occasioned a dispute, whether the first settlers of Massachusetts were of the Church of England or not."‡ And he pithily, and with not too much causticity, adds, "However problematical it may be, what they were while they remained in England, they left no room for doubt after they arrived in America."[79]

Yes, they left "no room for doubt," indeed, respecting their views of Episcopacy, &c.; in spite of cautious letters from their friends at home, "to guard against what they deemed too great a deviation from the Episcopal Establish-

[79] See Note 79.

* Hubbard's New England, pp. 126, 127. † Magnalia, i. 69.
‡ Hutch. Hist. i. 24.

ment."* Hubbard, however, one of the Puritan historians, represents them as, notwithstanding, quite afloat at first, respecting the subject of an ecclesiastical platform for *themselves*. They came to practice, "the positive part of Church Reformation;" when, really, they had no clear mind at all about the matter they thought it so necessary to forsake their native land to exemplify. "It doth not appear," he says, "that these were like those of New Plymouth, aforehand moulded into any order or form of Church government." They were not, he adds, "precisely fixed upon any particular order, or form of government; but, like *rasa tabula*, fit to receive any impression that could be delineated out of the word of God, or vouched to be according to the pattern in the mount, AS THEY JUDGED."† They knew enough to dislike "some things in the discipline and ceremonies of the Church of England," and also "that pattern of separation set up before them in Plymouth;" (alas, even Mr. Young's pilgrims pronounced separatists!) but where the truth lay, they no more knew, than they did the secrets of the wilderness they were entering.‡

Nor did they know, "as they judged," for years, as he further informs us; "until Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker came over."§ Then, light at last shone upon that dark subject, which they had chased the sun three thousand miles to have illuminated. Mr. Cotton settled all matters of obscurity, as soon and as effectually, as the Coryphæus of all infallibles at Rome. Under Mr. Cotton's magic touch, who knew so much about "bloody tenets," and the "power of the keys," the clouded jasper of yesterday becomes to-day pellucid gold. "And such was the authority they (espe-

* Felt's Salem, p. 15. † New England, p. 117.

‡ Their pattern may be found in Acts xix. 32.—Congregational societies are said to be as old as apostolic times. If so, this must have been the first.

§ New England, p. 182.

cially Mr. Cotton) had in the hearts of the people, that whatever he delivered in the pulpit, was soon put into an order of court, if of a civil, or set up as a practice in the church, if of an ecclesiastical concernment."* This is not a very amiable picture of discernment, stability, or independence, as to either church or state matters, in those who thought the majority of England, "as they judged," so ignorant, or so dogmatical, that they must bid them an everalsting farewell, and set them a "positive" example of *genuine* "reformation." Still, as it is a picture which they have sat for, before one of their self-chosen painters, we must fain believe it a correct one, and give it, according to the law of Pope Pius's creed, "due honor and veneration."

Well, let these things pass for *professions*, and especially *intelligent professions*, as to their feelings towards the Church of England generally. Come we now to that delicate and sensitive subject, that subject which the descendants of the Puritans talk of, as if one of the veriest trifles, and act about, as if one of the deepest grievances, when Churchmen make it an affair of conscience—I mean the subject of ORDINATION.

What opinion did the Puritans entertain of the ordinations of their Anglican "mother," who was so "dear," that they absolutely dreaded the mere thought, of being deserted in her "prayers and affections"? President Stiles, in his famous Election sermon in 1783, which contains, says his biographer, Dr. Holmes, "a fund of political, scientific and theological truth,"† contended that the orders of Congregational ministers are, *ipso facto*, the same with those of min-

* New England, p. 182.—For want of room, and their length, I cannot quote, for the amusement and instruction of my readers, the very caustic comments of a Presbyterian on Master Cotton's erratic course.—See Baillie's Dissuasive, pp. 55–59.

† Holmes' Life of Stiles, p. 286.—An English editor called it, waggishly, "The new American Encyclopedia."

isters of the Church of England. The first Congregational ministers of this country, he says, were ministers of the Church of England, and as presbyters can ordain presbyters, the Congregationalists have "the succession," as well, and as effectually, as Churchmen. His argument however must claudicate a little, even if we grant that a presbyter may be a sufficient ordainer; for it so happens that "the brethren," in no orders at all, unless it be the order of "the seven pillars," took a principal, if not a sole part, in Congregational ordinations.

"Where," says Mr. Hubbard, "there is not a Presbytery pre-existing, either some of the brethren ordain, as is above described," &c.* He was describing the ordination, or rather re-ordination of Mr. Cotton, to which allusion will be made before this letter is finished. It is important, however, to remark, that Mr. Hubbard also says, in narrating the re-ordination of Mr. Cotton, "These circumstances and order of procedure are more particularly set down, because, EVER SINCE that time, they generally proceed after the same manner, in the ordination of their ministers in the Congregational churches in New England."† Mr. Noah Hobart, who was a high-church Congregationalist,‡ like President Stiles and others, stiffly denies this position of brother Hubbard, when holding a controversy with Mr. Beach the Episcopalian, and formerly Rector of Trinity Church, Newtown, Connecticut. He affirms that these ordinations were installations, (do Congregationalists ever lay on hands at an installation?) and that they were never performed by the brethren at all, "a very few instances excepted." Indeed, he is so provoked with Mr. Beach, for presuming to contravene his opinions, that he calls him "a New Light Sepa-

* New England, p. 189. † Ibid. p. 189.

‡ Hobart, *e. g.* does not admit the truth of the Nag's Head fable. Second Address, Boston, 1751, p. 74.

ratist:*—a Churchman denounced as a new light and a separatist by Puritans!! a compliment for standing reference, when they wince under our milder appellation of "Dissenters."† Now Mr. Hubbard, it will be perceived, says distinctly, that *ever since* Mr. Cotton's day, which was in 1633, down to his own, (he died in 1704,) they generally proceeded as in Mr. Cotton's case; and that he was very particular about that case, for that very reason. Mr. Hobart died in 1773. Could the practice have changed so vastly, as Mr. Hobart, with his high-church notions about succession and ordination, was inclined to represent it, in seventy years, and especially, when for some seventy years previously, it had pursued one general steady course? I leave my readers to judge in such an issue, whether to believe Mr. Hobart in a piece of controversy, or Mr. Hubbard in a portion of history—and that too when Mr. Allen in his Biog. Dict. (p. 474,) does not hesitate to admit, that ancient and modern writers, such even as Mather in his Magnalia, Hutchinson in his History, and Holmes in his Annals, have all referred to Hubbard for their materials.[80] ‡

But I have not done with this case of re-ordinations. There is evidence to prove the theological *theory* on which the Puritans acted in it, and which, as it appears to me, must blow Mr. Hobart's plea about installations to the winds, and set the subject at rest forever.

[80] See Note 80.

---

* Congregationalists, &c. wince, as I say further on. But it was once their habit to call Episcopalians "New England Dissenters." See Reply to Eleutherius Enervatus, p. 16, Boston, 1733. And here is Mr. Hobart calling them, Separatists and New Lights!! And that is not the worst of it. As far back as 1654, in Johnson's celebrated tract, I find Churchmen numbered among the *Sectaries*.—Mass. H. Coll. 2d Ser. ii. 58.—Be no longer testy, O Puritan, under the milder term Dissenter.

† See Hobart's Sec. Address, pp. 90–99.

‡ Mr. Bacon seems to admit the early ordinations, as lay ordinations, with tolerable composure. Hist. Disc. pp. 293–295.

I find that evidence in the Annals of Salem, by Mr. Felt, pp. 104, 105. So early, it appears, as 1637, the proper ground or theory to be assumed about ordinations performed by a bishop, became a solemn and anxious subject of discussion, before an ordaining council in the town of Concord in Massachusetts. And what was the Puritan adjudication on the matter? I give it in Mr. Felt's own words, that there may be no possible misrepresentation on my part. It was this: "Such as were clergymen in England, by the call of their people, were to be respected as having there legally sustained the office of ministers. But for accepting the call of a bishop, they ought to humble themselves and repent. Having come to this country, they should not consider themselves as regular ministers, until called by another church. When thus elected, they were to be accounted as ministers, even before ordination."[81]

This is the canonical clue, and a precise one, to lead us straight up to the true solution of every case. It shows, at once, when, and why, and how, Episcopal clergymen, coming from England, were to be received in a clerical character; the reason for a favorable reception, or otherwise, in any given instance; and the proper manner of proceeding with it. But it also shows, incontestably and most notoriously, that ordination by a bishop, that what Churchmen would call ordination, and what only they would call ordination, was worth, in a Puritan's eye, just, aye, literally just nothing.* Nay, such an ordination was a thing to be humbled under, and repented of, as a transgression

[81] See Note 81.

* Episcopal ordination had to be renounced, before an English clergyman could be so much as a private member of a Puritan congregation in Holland; *i. e.* the congregation of Hugh Peters, who afterwards went to New England. So a *Presbyterian* tells us. Doubtless, the theory of Peters became law in New England; if not there already, when he arrived in 1635. See Baillie's Dissuasive, p. 75.

against God. It should bow us to the dust. We must be absolved from it as a crime.*

Be this, then, never forgotten, in all our difficulties with Congregationalists, when they upbraid us for illiberality, bigotry, anti-Christian hostility, because we will not make the laws of Christ, respecting the polity of his Church, bend to their convenience—be this, I say, never forgotten, that the day has been, when they repudiated Episcopal ordination, not as a nullity merely, but as a grievous offence against God—a thing to be recanted like a falsehood †—a thing for which a man should bow down his head as a bulrush, and cry with the Publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner!" And if their theory was ever good for any thing, and is good for any thing still, many and many an Episcopal clergyman has yet to be humbled and penitent for an ordination, for which the Church has taught her children to say, "that thou hast vouchsafed to call these thy servants to the office and ministry, appointed for the salvation of mankind, we render unto thee most hearty thanks." For many and many an Episcopal clergyman is not a parish minister at all; and many, if not all, of those who are parish ministers, (as in this State of New York, *e. g.*,) are such by an election of vestrymen, and not by the vote of the congregation.

Nay, if Puritan theory, consecrated in a Platform, was ever good for any thing, and is still of any value, the possession of the ministerial office apart from a congregation, is utterly impossible, and a man should be ordained twenty times over, if he have as many different parishes, in this

* And yet, says Hubbard, "nor did they ever disown the Church of England to be a true church."—(Hubbard's New England, p. 181.) A *true* church without ordination! No wonder the Congregationalists cling to such an idea!

† "A minister standing upon his ministry, as of the Church of England, was compelled to recant some words."—(Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d Ser. iii. 81. —That is, no doubt, compelled to recant his Episcopal ordination.

changeful age. The Cambridge Platform (ch. ix., sect. 7) distinctly says, "He that is clearly loosed from his office relation unto that church whereof he was a minister, cannot be looked at as an officer, nor perform any act of office in any other church, unless he be again orderly called unto office; which, when it shall be, we know nothing to hinder, but imposition of hands also, in ordination, ought to be used towards him again. For so Paul the apostle received imposition of hands twice at least, from Ananias. (Acts ix. 17, and xiii."*) It is somewhat amusing to find Paul ordained by Ananias,† even before his baptism, as in the first instance, and without even the presence of his ordainer, as in the second, and in both instances without a congregation; and yet Ananias is all the while an excellent Congregationalist! But we must let such dainties pass, to go on with the argument.

No man is a minister, then, on the Puritan theory, who has not been called by a congregation, and is so no longer than such call subsists.‡ And if so called, he is a minister, whether or not a bishop, a presbytery, or the "seven pillars," or "the gifted brethren," do, or do not, lay hands on him. This ceremony of ordination and imposition of hands is a mere circumstance, decent and pretty enough, but by no means essential, nor derogated in any degree whatever, if repeated a dozen times over.§ And what is most singular, Socinians believe this, and practice on it, at this very day, with more strictness than do Calvinists!

* Compare Hooker's Survey, Pt. ii. p. 61, etc.

† Moreover, the Apost. Constitutions make Ananias a layman; but that, I suppose, is quite as it should be.

‡ Camfield's Exam. of the Independents' Catechism. London, 1668, pp. 226, 235.

§ Camb. Platform. See the whole of Chap. IX.—Once, however, they thought better, and said (Presbyterians attesting) "ordination is necessary by Divine Institution." Jus Divinum Min. Evangel. ed. 1654, p. 157.

What! Socinians stricter Congregationalists than their Calvinistic brethren—I should say, namesakes? I do mean even and literally so. The inconsistency of the principles of the old Platform, with the ordination of an "Evangelist," (as he is called,) by a Presbytery, Consociation, or Association, or Representative Council, is at once manifest, *i. e.*, if they act in their own name, and not *for* some specific congregation, and *at* their express request; for then, upon the principle, *qui facit per alium, &c.*, the congregation in question act. Now the Socinians are shrewd enough to perceive this. They govern themselves accordingly. When I formerly lived in Massachusetts, I knew the late Hollis professor of divinity in Harvard University refuse to act in ordaining a young gentleman an Evangelist, for a congregation in Meadville, Pennsylvania, until he knew that the congregation had, by vote, constituted him their minister. Then, of course, it was very safe to make a man a minister, who was one already![82]

But I cannot dilate longer upon the Congregational theory of ordinations, and the view which, upon such theory, must be taken of ordinations by a bishop only—ordinations in which the people are not allowed to mingle at all, unless their approbation of a candidate by a standing committee be considered an election of him by the laity; and if so, he would be a minister before he so much as reached a bishop's hands—two or three laymen being, I believe, the canonical number for constituting a "Congregational church." Let us come now to facts, to see how the theory in question was carried into effect.*

On Friday, August 27, 1630, Mr. Wilson, who had been

[82] See Note 82.

* Hutchinson declares that re-ordination of Episcopalians was a Puritan practice *in* England, as well as *out* of it. (Hist. Mass. i. 369.) So here is proof upon proof, of their utter disregard of Episcopal orders.

ordained by a bishop, and Mr. Nowell, who had not, were admitted to orders in the Congregational establishment of Massachusetts, by the *pro hac vice* ordaining laity. True, Mr. Winthrop, who was one of them, declares, "We used imposition of hands, but with this protestation by all, that it was only as a sign of election and confirmation, not of any intent that Mr. Wilson should renounce his *ministry* he received in England."* And to this it would be an abundant reply to say, they were as yet *rasa tabula*, as Mr. Hubbard calls them, on which the explicit dogma of 1637, when Master Cotton had signed the writing and the decree, had not yet been inscribed. But there is an answer nearer home. An unfortunate emendation hangs about this passage, which alloys its apparently weighty testimony. It has undergone the retouchings of an antiquarian; and how much of tare and trett there may be in it, as there sometimes is, according to the learned Thomas James,† in a retouched sentence of the Christian Fathers, one cannot undertake to say. The word *ministry*, which has been italicized, so as to draw attention towards it, is not contained in the Hartford edition of 1790, of Winthrop's Journal. On the contrary, that which, whether as a word, or something more substantial, was so often hovering around the day, if not the night dreams of the early settlers of Massachusetts, occupies its place. In that edition the sentence reads, "not of any intent that Mr. Wilson should renounce his *money!*"‡ This reading is not adopted, indeed, by the careful Mr. Savage; but still he by no means discards it from his margin. And

* Savage's Wint. i. 32, 33.

† A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the prelates, pastors, and pillars of the Church of Rome, for the maintenance of Popery. By Thomas James, &c. New edit. by Rev. J. E. Cox. London, 1843.

‡ Hartford edit. p. 20.

there are several reasons why we may suspect the old reading to be the true one, which I will now proceed to give.

The Puritans had just been professing as much affection and deference for the Church of England, as could have been expected from her most loyal sons. They had incurred the suspicion of being covert Churchmen. They never had the reputation of doing avoidable acts, which would entail upon them the loss of property. For, as Hurd testifies of the Puritans of this very era, "The Independents were more favored than the Presbyterians; and as they had no objection against money, they accepted of the grand church livings, while at the same time they were exclaiming against clerical power."* Moreover, Mr. Wilson made two visits to England on account of money. One is mentioned by Hubbard;† the other by Mather, who says he brought back with him a thousand pounds‡ for New England's benefit.§ His eldest son could travel on the continent of Europe, and take a doctor's degree in physic in Italy—a thing not to be done by a poor man's son.|| Put all these things together, and then consider whether it is not quite reasonable to imagine, that, under the circumstances of Mr. Wilson's ordination, and the feelings with which it was performed, the Puritans would not venture something, which, if that ordination were construed into an act of insubordination towards their "dear mother," would prevent, if possible, its being so construed, as to lose them any of that mother's silvered smiles?

Perhaps it is quite unnecessary to argue this case any longer. It may be somewhat amusing to my readers, however, to see how the candid Mr. Neal contrives to blink

* Religious Ceremonies, p. 586. † New England, p. 140.

‡ These thousand pounds were spent in purchasing cannon!! The Puritans had full faith in "infallible artillery."—See Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, ii. 59.

§ Magnalia, i. 281, 282. || Ibid. i. 283.

the agency of the brethren in Mr. Wilson's case, though he tells *half* the truth, viz. that Wilson was re-ordained. He says that Mr. W., "though an ordained minister of the Church of England, submitted to a re-ordination by such hands, as the church invited to pray for a blessing on his labors."*

Let us now take up another case. In the year 1633, Mr. Thomas Hooker, also a presbyter of the Church of England, came over, and joined the Massachusetts Puritans. But on the 11th of October in the same year, he was, according to President Stiles, in his Election Sermon, (p. 103, 2d edit.) ordained "then again by the brethren at Newtown," *alias* Cambridge. Dr. Holmes endorses this, in his history of Cambridge, (p. 39,) and Allen, in his Biographical Dictionary, p. 464.

In the same year came over Master Cotton himself, who was the Cardinal Bellarmine of Massachusetts, in enforcing the power of the Congregational keys, and the "bloody tenets" of its virtual Inquisition. Master Cotton had been long a preacher in the Establishment, and became a convert of the Puritans. He "was now a Christian minister," says Mr. Allen, in his Dictionary.† Nevertheless even he had to receive orders from the fountain-head; and was accordingly re-ordained at Boston. The ceremony was performed by the laically ordained Mr. Wilson and his two elders. The scene was made as imposing as it well could be. The congregation were called on to testify their consent. They did not do it, as in the Church of England, by reverend silence, but by lifting up their hands as they would do to elect a constable. Mr. Wilson then demanded of Mr. Cotton, if he accepted the election thus pronounced. With an emphatic pause, and expressions of great humility, he assented. "Then," says the historian, "the pastor and the two

* Neal's New England, i. 133.

† Page 307, col. a.

ruling elders, laying their hands upon his head, the pastor prayed, and speaking to him by his name, did thereby design him to the said office,* in the name of the Holy Ghost, and did give him the charge of the congregation, and did thereby, as by a sign from God, endue him, at least prayed that he might be endued, with gifts fit for his office, and largely did bless him."†

Upon this case, so striking and peculiar, I cannot but pause for two or three observations. One is, that while it is, in a Puritan vocabulary, Popish and impious for a consecrated bishop to say, at an ordination, "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," it is perfectly lawful, Protestant, and righteous, for a Puritan presbyter, with two laymen, to say, "John Cotton, we do hereby design thee to the said office, in the name of the Holy Ghost, and do give thee the charge of this congregation, and do hereby, as by a sign from God, endue thee with gifts fit for thy office, and do largely bless thee." It matters not that Hubbard faltered a little, in his later day, and said, "at least prayed that he might be endued," &c. Mr. Hubbard's private judgment is nothing to us, inquiring into public facts. The good old fashion was, to design a candidate for ordination in the name of the Third Person in the Sacred Trinity, and, in that awful name, to blaspheme which is the soul's perdition, to endue him with the gifts his office might require. Moreover, grievous as outward signs are, when they assume the shape of that blessed Cross, on which the redemption of a world was "finished," yet there are such things as outward signs, not positively commanded, (for where is it made an essential of ordination

* He was already a presbyter of the Church of England, now to be promoted to the office of *teacher* in the Establishment of New England. The Puritans thought *three* orders wrong; so they had *four*, viz. pastor, teacher, ruling-elder, and deacon.

† Hubbard's New England, p. 188.

that hands must be imposed—I mean in *so many words* of Holy Writ, the warrant Puritans require?) which, nevertheless, can be instrumental in conveying ("by a sign") divine gifts and graces.

Again, I say, it matters not how much Mr. Hubbard modified, or Puritans may modify. The old Platforms themselves may be dismissed into oblivion and dust; and are so, for, as Mr. E. A. Newton says, Who dare preach them now? But to us, that is a very small matter. We want to know what Puritanism was in the days of its glory; the days now chanted of in the song, and glorified by the eloquence of oratory. We find such Puritanism, with *laymen* at its side, using just such language at an ordination, as our Church puts into the mouths of bishops; and we ask, how far it advanced towards "the positive part of Church Reformation in America?"*

To this it may not be amiss to add, what Cotton's namesake says, in his "Account of the Church of Christ in Plymouth," (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st ser. iv. 135,) "The church here had left the communion of the Church of England, many years before their coming over; and this not so much upon the account of doctrine, (although they thought their Articles too general and short,) as upon the account of discipline, and government, and ceremonies. The two latter they looked upon as relics of Popery, without Scripture warrant, and encroachments upon the kingly office of Christ." Yet their brethren, hard by, practised discipline, and government, and ceremonies of the most fearless sort. They ordained with laymen, till the leather-mitten ordination,† and sometimes by laymen only. They re-ordained the priests

* As to the extreme church-power, used by these positive reformers, Mr. Felt gives us instances of the excommunication of a church by a church.—Felt's Salem, pp. 413, 520. This matches the mutual excommunication of the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople.

† As we have seen. For convenience' sake, I give the reference anew.—Eliot's Biog. Dict. p. 101. Note.

of their own "dear mother," "the Church of God in England." They gave the Holy Ghost in ordination. They did all this, "as by a sign," which commended itself to the outward senses. And yet they forsook and disowned the Church of England, and her most solemn acts in the conveyance of sacerdotal character; because, forsooth, such acts were too formal, and presumed too largely. Well may we say of such, in the language of St. Paul, "Thou, therefore, which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?" (Romans ii. 21.)

Some may think I have said quite sufficient; but there remains another case, which describes a Puritan view of the ordinations of the Church of England so graphically, that I cannot refrain from giving it. Mr. Francis Higginson, the father of the stately John, who wanted his morning and evening beadle to help him mount his parish throne, was ordained at Salem, July 20, 1629. There was a pastor and a teacher to be inaugurated; for the Puritans believed (would to heaven they had never done worse!) in division of parochial labor. They had no rectors and curates, but pastors and teachers: or, as we might say, associate rectors. Mr. Skelton was to be the pastor on this occasion, and Mr. Higginson the teacher. So Mr. Higginson, in the capacity of layman,[83] (repenting duly for his Episcopal ordination,) "with three or four more of the gravest members of the church, laid their hands on Mr. Skelton, using prayers therewith." Then Mr. Skelton, with the same "present and assisting" peers, performed the same kind office for Mr. Higginson. And thus, says a witness of the scene, "I hope that you, and the rest of God's people with you, will say that here was a right foundation laid, and that these two blessed servants of the Lord came in at the door, and not at the window."*

[83] See Note 83.

* Felt's Annals of Salem p. 28.

Alas, good chronicler, if this be laying a right foundation, when you acknowledge the Church of England your "dear mother," and thus dishonor her most reverend acts—if this be coming in at the right door, after jumping *out* of her windows, then, though at the peril of being unwritten by you among the people of the Lord, I must deny and forbid your hope. It was a sad day's work; and error, heresy, and schism, on the very spot where it was performed, now triumph beyond the truth, and attest its sad adventure. Universalism and Socinianism lift a prouder head in Salem, and count more converts there than Puritan Calvinism, at this very hour. And if Skelton and Higginson, both ministers of the Church of England, and both re-ordained under Puritan auspices, could now walk Salem's streets, and, by a fiat of their wills, could re-write history, and suppress all that would offend them, by changing all its congregations into churches, bearing their "dear mother's" name, the transformation would at once be made, and the work of two centuries ago be cheerfully pronounced undone. Ah, how little do men know, when they start developments, where the developments they countenance will end. "I am very confident," says Robinson, "that God has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word."* And thus he launched a new sect upon the ocean of speculation. And that very sect's descendants now plead this sanction, for every error the human mind can coin, and christen with a religious name.† Oh, history, if thou couldst be unwritten, a thousand pens would fly freely to thy service from would-be Reformers' hands!

But this much must suffice to show, how the Puritans,

* That was his *exoteric* doctrine. In his *esoteric*, he warned them against novelties. This was in a *private* letter. See Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Ser. ix. 32.

† See Upham's defence of Unitarianism, called "Principles of the Reformation."—Salem, Mass. 1826.

after professions of the deepest attachment to the Church of England, calling her the Church of God, and asking her love and prayers, have set at defiance her most solemn and sacred acts, and counted them empty nullities, or heresies to be recanted, or sins to be contemplated with penitence and humility. And this, too, while those very acts have been equalled or surpassed, in formality and assumptions, by acts intended to be, in comparison, examples of "positive" virtue. I will close with these questions: Can those who think even a *lay* re-ordination necessary, after an ordination by bishops, complain with much decency of those, who think an Episcopal re-ordination necessary, after an ordination by laymen?* Should they not rather, in the language of good old Thomas Fuller,† "blush themselves out of their former follies, and by degrees cordially reconcile themselves to the Church of England?"

LETTER IX.

In my last letter, I began to illustrate the treatment, which the Episcopal Church in this country has received from the Puritans. In formally opening this fruitful subject, it was necessary, as a preliminary, to expose the *pro-*

* All Congregational ordinations are virtually laical; for as the *first* were so, all the rest must be. A stream cannot rise higher than its fountain. As to the sensitiveness of the Puritans, upon re-ordinations by bishops, see the furious article in Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Ser. ii. 133, etc. It is a *vile indignity*, &c., &c., for bishops to do such a thing; but for "the good old cause so signally owned by God," (p. 132, same vol.) it is all right.

† Thoughts, p. 259.

fessed feelings of Puritans towards us; and authorities were accordingly given which displayed them pretty fully. The manner in which such professions were carried out, in relation to one of our most distinctive principles, that one which has given us our familiar name of Episcopalians, was the first point, in this department of our subject, which then received attention. A wide field, of course, remains to be traversed; far wider than will admit of those extended investigations, which properly belong to history. Still, though attempting memoranda rather than a full detail, I hope to give sufficient to justify my general aim, a defence against Puritan aspersions by an appeal to Puritan practice. Those who are anxious to go more deeply can readily do so, by means of the clues to which my very frequent references will guide them.* In England, the aim of the Puritans was, as they represented it, freedom and universal toleration. In New England, they enjoyed the one, and might have accorded the other; but here they forgot their "first love," and, like Diotrephes, were content with nothing but supreme and unshared pre-eminence. And this is no strange political revolution; for, says Mr. Ferguson, "The passion for independence and the love of dominion, frequently arise from a common source: there is in both an aversion to control; and he who in one situation cannot brook a superior, may in another dislike to be joined with an equal."* We are now to see how they, who abhorred dominion in Episcopacy, on one side of an ocean, illustrated their own fondness for it, when, on that ocean's hither side, this same Episcopacy became a suitor to themselves.

Singular as it may seem, that spot from which more opposition to Episcopacy has emanated, than from any in all

* Some may complain of these. I will only say, once for all, I was requested, most particularly, not to spare references.

† Civ. Society, p. 445.

America, the site of Boston, was first inhabited, and indeed owned, by a partaker of the prerogatives of the celebrated "apostolic succession."* William Blackstone, an Episcopal clergyman, was the first settler and owner of the peninsula of Boston. The charter of 1629 superseded his title,† but still the authorities gave him some fifty acres of the soil, if he should choose to remain and cultivate them. But the manifestations of that Puritanism, which had called England's Church a "dear mother," and asked for her continued love and intercessions, were by no means to his taste. He is the individual who made the cutting remark, that he came to this country to avoid my lord bishops, and must now remove again, to avoid my lord brethren! ‡ He sold all his estate, went off, bag and baggage, to Rhode Island, and settled on Blackstone River, a few miles north of Providence—a river which commemorates his name even now. His residence may also be known, more accurately, by a small round eminence, called "Study Hill," which was his place of retirement. Mr. Blackstone lived till 1675. As good an account of him, as any, may be found in Allen's Biog. Dict. pp. 108, 109, which supplies me with dates; but which, not unnaturally, passes over in silence his testimony to the early autocracy of the Puritan Court of High Commission. Blackstone's case is very important, to show that Puritanism was intolerable, and from almost the shortest experience, to a refugee from prelatical tyranny.

Mr. Blackstone sold his Boston estate, preparatory to a final removal from a Puritan regime, in 1634; and, not improbably, was quickened in his action by the cases of the

* "That vile, senseless, wretched whimsey," says Cotton Mather, etc. So Episcopalians can see how sweetly they were talked about, in old times, as well as now. Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Ser. ii. 134.

† This shows how they looked upon a title, under the Charter, as swallowing up all other titles.

‡ Baylies' Plymouth, Pt. i. p. 200.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st Ser. ix. 2.

Browns, of Bright, and of Morell, which I will now proceed to notice.*

Messrs. John and Samuel Brown were among the emigrants who came to Salem, Mass., with Mr. Francis Higginson, and the fleet of five ships, and more than fifty guns, in 1629. In such high repute were they with the Governor, &c., of Massachusetts, at home, (for it is to be remembered the Charter did not come over till the *magnates* brought it in 1630, and insisted upon bringing it, as a *sine qua non* of their settlement!) that they gave them a recommendation to this effect: "Through many businesses, we had almost forgotten to recommend unto you, two brethren of our Company, Mr. John and Mr. Samuel Brown, who, though they be no adventurers in the general stock, yet are they men we do much respect, being fully persuaded of their sincere affections to the good of the Plantation;†—the one, Mr. John Brown, is sworn an Assistant *here*, and by us chosen one of the Council *there;* a man experienced in the laws of our kingdom, and such an one as we are persuaded will worthily deserve your favor and furtherance, which we desire he may have, and that in the first division of lands, there may be allotted to either of them two hundred acres."‡

It will be perceived, at once, that this was an almost *carte blanche*, from the highest authority, short of royal, known to Massachusetts, in behalf of these gentlemen, vouching for their characters, for their disinterestedness, for the peculiar intelligence and capability of one, and for the desert of both, of the Plantation's most substantial grace, in the shape of "entire property in soil." One is mentioned as having official rank under the Charter, both at home and in Massachusetts; and the other, as we learn from Mr.

* Chalmers, pp. 145, 146.

† This is worthy note. Even its own Governor, then, does not call Massachusetts a colony, but a mere plantation.

‡ Felt's Annals of Salem, p. 19.

Felt, was a member of the Council of Massachusetts, as well as his namesake the esteemed jurist.* Perhaps two individuals could not have touched New England's shore under fairer auspices, or hoped for higher consideration.

But, most unfortunately, these intelligent and sincerely affectioned individuals,† worthy of all favor and furtherance, even to the extent of a handsome share of Puritan real estate, had interpreted such language, as their fellow-passenger Mr. Higginson used, and the company of Gov. Winthrop used, somewhat too strictly. They did most truly, in very deed, esteem "the Church of God in England," as none the less a Church, because some three thousand miles away. They did not think the first step in "the positive part of Church reformation," (especially when the minds of those about them were *rasa tabula*, and they had no idea of what such reformation should justly be,) consisted in downright separation from that Church, in throwing all her most sacred rites and symbols to the winds, and treating them as filth and rubbish. No. They did actually, and in all honesty, suppose, that the Church of England was God's Church still, and not the Church of man, to be moulded after the fashion of man's capricious choice. If that Church's practices had been in some respects silently dropped, probably they would not have murmured. But they soon discovered that the new reformation was to be any thing but negative—it was to be "positive" with emphasis. They found the Church of England and the Government of England assailed, not in the sermons only, but in the very prayers of the Puritan ministers.‡ This is a practice which, it is well known, has

* See Annals of Salem, p. 21.

† Here comes another specimen of Mr. Bancroft's want of candor. In his *first* edition he calls "one an experienced and meritorious lawyer." In his *seventh*, he dashes his pen through "meritorious," and blots it out! See Vol. i. 378, first edit. and vol. i 349, seventh edit.

‡ Felt's Salem, p. 38.

been imitated from that day to this in Puritan pulpits;* where probably as severe things have been said against democrats and sectarians, in sermons and prayers, as in political pamphlets and newspapers.

The Browns resented such inconsistency with solemn professions, such unfilial "loathing of that milk wherewith they were nourished," and they withdrew.† Still they did not resort to a house of public worship, erected by themselves, but to a private dwelling; a sanctuary which, as Lord Chatham said, the king *dare* not enter unpermitted, but which a Puritan magistrate could burst open without ceremony to ferret out heretics.‡ There they hoped, quietly and without molestation, to listen to the calm, impartial services of the Church of England—services in which, blessed be God! insinuation and slander, the praise or the dispraise of governments, or sects, or individuals, have not a nook to nestle in. Nor is it more wonderful that they should have preferred such services, than that many of the most intelligent and upright *laymen*, of our own day, should do so. Who has not a right, a most sacred right, to be jealous to the last degree of the language, which a frail, and fallible, and perhaps excited mortal, may palm off, *in his name*, upon "The Father of an infinite Majesty?" and who, therefore, may not contend for a liturgy, and nothing but a liturgy, with unfaltering independence? nay who *must* not, for successful prayer of intercession? since such prayer depends upon agreement, (Matt. xviii. 19,) and agreement, without words agreed upon, is worse than the concord of Puritan creeds; of which there are dozens, all open to denial in their

* See Quincy's Harv. Univ. i. 203; Peirce's Harv. Univ. p. 163; Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Ser. iv. 120.

† This withdrawment Cotton Mather represents, as a persecution of the new order in Church and State! Magnalia, i. 67.

‡ Felt's Salem, p. 257.

particulars, and yet all alike believed in "for substance of doctrine."

But let us not wander from history into argumentation. What was the fate of the Messrs. Brown? Oh, Endicott, an Episcopalian yesterday, but converted to-day to Plymouth separatism by a Plymouth doctor,* had rule in Salem. And Endicott, "being of a hot temper, and not possessed of the greatest prudence," as Dr. Gordon soon after tells us, "summoned the brothers before him, as ringleaders of a faction." Ringleaders of a faction, worshipping God in the prayers of that mother, in whose bosom their judges had received "such hope and part, as they had obtained in the common salvation!" And this, too, when, as their historian Hubbard says, that with reference to any departure from that mother's ecclesiastical economy, "they had not as yet waded so far into the controversy of church discipline, as to be very positive in any of those points, wherein the main hinge of the controversy lay between them and others!"†

However, let these self-contradictions pass, with a retinue soon to follow. How did Endicott treat his fellow-magistrates, so "worthily deserving his favor and furtherance," and hundreds of broad New England acres? They were forthwith denounced, says Mr. Felt, as "factious and evil-conditioned."‡ And then they were, "notwithstanding their being counsellors,"§ and notwithstanding their loud remonstrances, sent packing home to England; and, by a curious coincidence, in the ship Lion, or Whelp, or Lion's Whelp, it is no great matter which: *similis simili gaudet.*‖ And in spite of such a refractory page, in the history of his favorite Puritanism, Mr. Hubbard can wink hard, and never see it; (he gives it all the go-by;) and, in view of the pre-

* Gordon's America, i. 20. Hubbard's New England, p. 115.

† New England, p. 118. ‡ Annals of Salem, p. 36.

§ Gordon, i. 21.

‖ Bancroft, i. 350. Hazard's Collect. i. 263.

cious letter on board the Arabella, complacently indite such a sentence as this : " Whatever any of their successors may judge thereof, it is sufficient to discover what was *then* in the minds of those that removed from their dear native land. If there be found any sort of persons, that since that time have imbibed other principles or opinions,[84] it is more than the writer hereof was ever acquainted with the reason of."* Hubbard lived till 1704; and so the Church of England continued a "dear mother" to the Puritans, fairly through the seventeenth, and into the eighteenth century. They promised, too, in their unasked letter, to give God no rest in her behalf, and wished their heads and hearts fountains of tears for her everlasting welfare! But let us see.

How fared it with the Messrs. Brown, even in England? "When," says Chalmers, "the persons who had been thus expelled arrived in England, they naturally applied to the governor and company for reparation of their wrongs; but it appears not from their records, that they ever received any redress. The insolence of contempt was superadded to the injustice of power. The letters which those gentlemen had written to their friends were intercepted, and read publicly in the General Court, on the pretence, equally mean and unjust, 'that they might possibly injure the plantation.' Thus early was introduced into the politics of Massachusetts, the dishonorable practice of appropriating the communications of private friendship, wrongfully obtained, to the malevolent purposes of party. It then rooted in her system, and in after-times produced abundantly."†

So, then, the first censors of Episcopacy in Massachusetts, could repudiate their own most solemn and unsolicited professions, and break open private letters, with as little

[84] See Note 84.

* New England, p. 125.

† Chalmers, p. 146, and the references Mr. C. gives, pp. 148, 149.

compunction as a Papal post-office. Even so let it be. Better the frowns than the smiles of such men.

Yet Mr. Felt insists upon it, that Endicott was right; because "for what he did in that affair, he had ample authority."* Just as if for this case, as for a thousand like it, the adage could not be found, "Ne sine formâ tantum scelus fiat." There is not the slightest pretension that Endicott was not clothed in the panoply of authority: and where was ever the tyrant who was not? "The Holy and Apostolic Court of the Inquisition" always has its powers fortified by signs manual, and seals enough, from Pope and King, to warrant its most direful and diabolical acts. And beyond all question, it was Ap. Laud's honest conviction of duty to a power above himself, and to the welfare of the kingdom, which made him a severe disciplinarian of those impracticable tempers; which would never let any thing control them but absolute force, and who, when that was removed, could never control themselves.† "His views of religious liberty were as just as those of the Puritans: the principles of both were the same: and while the practices of the Puritans are attributed to the principles of the age, the same allowance must in justice be made for the Archbishop."‡ But all this avails nothing. Endicott was a most righteous judge, "a second Daniel;" and Laud a most unrighteous persecutor, "a second Saul of Tarsus." I know the logical conclusion so well, from long experience, that I am able to state it beforehand for my Puritan readers, (if such persons may, by some chance accident, stumble upon my pages,) and thus save.

* Annals of Salem, p. 39.

† "The violence of some men's tempers," says Hubbard, describing *one* Puritan contention, when in fact it will answer for a *Catholic* description, "makes them raise debates, when they do not justly offer themselves, and like millstones grind one another, when they want other grist." Hubbard's New Eng. p. 143.

‡ Lathbury, p. 168.

them the labor of anticipation. For other references to the Browns, see Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st Series, vi. 242, 245, and ix. 4, 5.[85]

Next to the case of the Browns comes that of the Rev Francis Bright. He was one of the four ministers, who came over in Mr. Higginson's fleet. He, too, seems to have labored under the same infirmity with the Browns; that of understanding language according to its natural tenor. He found Mr. Higginson and Mr. Skelton inclined to establish a totally new ecclesiastical polity in Salem. He disagreed with them, and removed; even before their reception of lay-orders at the hands of the brethren.* He went to Charlestown, and attempted to sustain his position, with a congregation of his own. But a year's trial satisfied him that the mania of revolution had infected the people, as well as the ministers, and he returned to England, to him now a "dear mother" in very deed. His attachment to Episcopacy, however, was enough to ruin him in the esteem of his brethren, though his piety was beyond all question.†

And, now, where were the heads and hearts turned into fountains of tears, for the affliction of one of their ecclesiastical parent's devoted children? Tears? Why Hubbard and Mather both make him the subject of their jeers and scorn. This is the way in which the first dismisses him: "He began to hew stones in the mountains, wherewith to build; but when he saw all sorts of stones would not suit the building as he supposed, [not the right of private judgment even allowed such an one,] he, not unlike Jonah, fled from the presence of the Lord, and went down to Tarshish."‡

[85] See Note 85.

* Gordon, i. 21.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, ix. 2.—"Mr. Bright, a godly minister." Hubbard's New England, p. 112.

‡ New England, p. 113.

The second mentions him in connexion with his colleague, Ralph Smith, thus. Smith, be it remembered, was more inclined to go a little too far for the Salem *duumviri*, while Bright was not inclined to go far enough; and it seems that, *rasa tabula* as their minds might be, they were quite able to see any one totally in the wrong, and totally worthy of condemnation, who did not agree to submit to their dictation in every thing. Smith went to Plymouth, and became a minister there; and Bright finally went home, as has been stated; but Mather thus recklessly blasts them both. "There were two that began to hew stones in the mountains, for the building of the temple here; but when they saw all sorts of stones would not fit in the building, the one betook himself to the seas again, and the other to till the land, for which cause, burying all further mention of them among the rubbish in the foundation of the Colony, we will proceed with our story."*

Now there could be no possible objection to burying an Episcopalian, like Bright, and a man of "low gifts and parts," like Smith, whom Higginson and Skelton could not make a useful tool of, beneath the rubbish of New England's foundations. This was their rhetorical destiny. But then to do it, as Mather has done, and represent one as becoming a sailor, and the other a farmer, because they ceased to "hew stones" for a Massachusetts ecclesiastical establishment, is a defiance of sober truth and fact, which could hardly be expected. Bright never abandoned his sacred profession, that I can any where learn; and Smith was long a Puritan preacher at Plymouth and Manchester.† Mather, however, would degrade one into a Jack Tar, and the other into a tiller of the ground; and yet he boasts that his history is written in the spirit of Catholic communion, and to tax schismatical persecution! ‡

* Magnalia, i. 63, 64.

† Baylies' Plymouth, Pt. i. 266.

‡ Magnalia, i. 35.

As to Morell's case, that has been noticed already. I will only add, concerning this most truly modest, peaceful, and intelligent man, whose attempted hierarchy and dull poem furnished Mr. Bancroft with a subject for his characteristic flippancy, what a fairer historian of Puritanism has said of him, in another place than one already referred to in the Massachusetts Historical Collections. "Had this gentleman been stimulated by religious zeal, had he been more remarkable for bigotry than for his learning and candor, like some who are to be found among every denomination of Christians, he would have excited contention, and given trouble to the other settlements. But instead of blowing the coals, he was disposed to extinguish the fire that had been kindled, and which a small matter would have spread." And then, in a note, after complimenting his "dull poem," he adds, "Will not every person who is without the prejudices of Dr. Cotton Mather, [and of Mr. Bancroft, he would have added at a later day,] give his tribute of respect to the memory of a man, who exhibited so much literature and virtue?"*

Massachusetts, however, was no place for such men as the Browns, or Bright, or Morell, so long as the slightest hankering after Episcopacy lingered in their breasts, and therefore, one after the other, *per fas aut nefas*, was compelled to bid it farewell. This Mr. Blackstone saw from his Beacon Hill, in Boston, with his observant eye. "The lord brethren" he beheld marching in the very footsteps of "the lord bishops," whose overshadowing power had made him flee. He was afraid that their little fingers would be thicker than the loins of their predecessors—he hastily parted with every foot of land, over which a Puritan sceptre could assert authority, and sought a refuge in Rhode Island; then, and long after, the well-known asylum for victims of Puritan malediction.

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, ix. 6.

In connexion with the case of the Browns, those who are familiar with the history of New England, might expect me to notice the case of William Vassall, who came over with them,* and whose name is somewhat notorious on Puritan pages, as being "almost, if not altogether," one of those malignants who "incline to bishops." But I passed him by to notice him here; since Mr. Deane, the historian of the town where he a good while resided, (Scituate,) doubts whether he were a genuine Churchman, because of his outward conformity to Puritan regimen.† Probably, Vassall might have loved Episcopacy as much in his *secret soul*, as his neighbors loved it in *a published letter*. The fate of the Browns was as wholesome a warning to him, as were the walls of the Bastile to many a poor Frenchman, whose spirit would gladly have bounded from its natal soil with the elastic sprightliness of freedom. So he determined to accomplish his object in a more circuitous, but more comprehensive method, by promoting, in every way he could, legislative toleration—that freedom for which Puritans in England ‡ had panted, petitioned, remonstrated, voted, rebelled, and finally drawn the sword and thrown away its scabbard, to conquer or die—not for that, but for their own, sole supremacy.

And now, forsooth, how is such a character, the very impersonation of themselves in England, (rebellion and fighting duly excepted,) how is he regarded in America? As "the chief of the busy and factious spirits, always opposite to the civil governments of the country, and the way of its churches." Aye, no doubt, they themselves thought so, in that old dusty age of Cotton Mather's "rubbish," when they were hewing stones and laying foundations, and none

* Vassall was a strong friend of the Browns. Eliot's Dict. pp. 464, 465.

† Deane's Scituate, p. 89.

‡ In *New* England, the Puritans called such toleration mere carrion!!" Hutchinson's Collect. p. 154.

saw clearly but their own bright eyes. Oh, would it were so! But the sentence comes from no lower an advocate of popular freedom, than the democratical Mr. Bancroft; who, like the Romans of yore, hates power most virulently, when you call it *rex*, but has no quarrel at all with it, when you call it *imperator*, or "Ancient Colony Laws."* The sentence quoted above, though mostly written by Vassall's ancient opponents, is by Mr. B. made absolutely his own, and emblazoned upon his pages. Nor is that all. He pronounces the same opinion upon the motives of Vassall, and such as acted in union with him, which was entertained by those who frowned upon them with true Puritan austerity. "In Boston," he says, "a powerful liberal party already openly existed. But now, the apparent purpose of advancing religious freedom, was made to disguise measures of the deadliest hostility to the frame of civil government. The nationality of New England was in danger."†

O, I could hardly believe it possible, for an advocate of religious liberty and independence—of the largest liberty in Church and State—to have written this, did I not know, beforehand, from infallible authority, that a man may see a mote in another's eye, while unconscious of a beam within his own! "The apparent purpose of advancing religious freedom, was made to disguise measures of the deadliest hostility to the frame of civil government"? Can it be, that a man of Mr. Bancroft's boastful knowledge of the original sources of history—who by a dash of his pen would blot the names of other historians, as "not trustworthy"‡—can it be, that such a man does not know, that this is one of the old charges against the Puritans themselves? Why his very words are an echo of Laud's own, already quoted in my second letter, "that these men do but begin with the

* Bancroft, i. 438. † Ibid, 437.

‡ Bancroft, i. 300, note.—On p. 287, Mr. B. eulogizes Robinson, because he wrote on "Separation" and justified it. Now here, he denounces "separation" from a Puritan establishment! Compare James, i. 23, 24.

Church, that they might after have the freer access to the State." But, *proh pudor!* what Ap. Laud found mathematically true in England, was not true, could not be true, and never will be true, of an appellant from Puritan domination! A statute of lese-majesty is an unpardonable oppression in a monarchy; a just self-defence, in a Puritan theocracy. Vassall would have been a patriot in England; in New England he was a factionist and a rebel. Ah, how exquisitely did Democritus satirize human nature when he said, that Truth hid herself in the bottom of a well!

And now, having given my readers a hint of the version, which an historian, like Mr. Bancroft, can put on a case like that of Vassall, seeking for toleration, I will dismiss it with the plain matter of fact statement of the Hon. Mr. Baylies. He had been speaking of the odious 'Test Act,' which made church-membership a necessary qualification for voting at a Puritan poll, and the preservation of which Mr. Bancroft identified with the continuance of "the nationality of New England"! "Some of the best men in the colony were precluded. William Vassall, Esq., of Scituate, who had been an Assistant in Massachusetts, and was one of the wealthiest as well as worthiest and most intelligent gentlemen of whom the colony could boast, was disqualified for office; for, although a Puritan, he continued an Episcopalian."*

Mr. Vassall, it will be remembered, was a member of the Colony of Plymouth. But there were unquestionably those, who thought with him upon the subject of toleration, in the Colony of Massachusetts, and he could influence such persons to action. This may explain to us the last memorable point in the history of Massachusetts, connected with Episcopacy, before she acquired almost entire independence, during the interregnum of the Crown, and even ventured to coin her own money like a sovereign state. With this point

* Baylies' Plymouth, Pt. i. 230.

of history, virtually,* though not formally, connected with that watchword for equal rights and privileges—the name of Vassall—I will close this letter.

"In 1646," says Dr. Morse, (Geog. p. 186,) "the Colony was disturbed by some of its principal inhabitants, who had conceived a dislike of some of the laws and the government. Several of these disaffected persons were imprisoned, and the rest compelled to give security for their future good behavior."†

And now, kind reader, what terrific disturbance do you suppose these inhabitants were guilty of, "principal" though they were? Something, no doubt, like a Hartford Convention, a Philadelphia riot, or the burning of religious houses, such as Charlestown, Mass., saw a few years since. No, nothing at all like either, or in any way approaching either, disguise and daub the matter as writers like Drs. Morse and Mather may try to do. These tremendous traitors only exercised that right, which some of the busy spirits of New England have knocked so long, and loudly, and vainly, at the doors of Congress, in order to enjoy to their hearts' content—the right of petition! And was that all? nothing but the right of petition? Why, the descendants of the Puritans have all but burst open the doors of the Hall of Representatives in Washington, and battered the Speaker out of his chair, because themselves could not be heard upon a subject setting our very Union on fire! But when the same right is demanded of their forefathers, the answer is, an arraignment at the bar of criminal justice, and the award is, fines, recognizances, or a prison. O remember this, New England, when we next hear your muttering thunders about the right of petition.‡

* Hutchinson's Hist. i. pp. 136, 137.

† Mather smuggles the g'st of this matter out of sight most effectually. Magnalia, i. 116.

‡ Or, to repeat the language of the Rev. Peter Hobart of Hingham, the

But who or what were these petitioners? One of them, at least, was a Churchman, and they all wanted more of separation between Church and State, and more freedom for members of the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland. The spirit of Vassall was with them, and he would cheerfully have given them aid; but about this time he sailed for England, and never returned, at least to Puritan soil.

Perhaps the story had better be given in the words of a Massachusetts annalist; and accordingly I shall go, where I have so often gone, to the Historical Collections. "No man in the plantation was allowed to hold an estate, or vote as a freeman, except he were a member of a Congregational church, such as the New England settlers had declared to be according to the model of primitive Christianity.[86] Mr. Maverick, who had fixed his tent on Noddle's island, and possessed some considerable property when the banks of Charles River were settled by our fathers, had been declared a freeman, though an Episcopalian; *which shows they were less rigid when they first came over, than they were afterwards.* As soon as they felt their consequence, they realized certain powers which they never would have dared to exercise, had it not been for the confusions in England. *There*, the Independents had the most influence, but they did not deprive other men, or sects, of the privilege of thinking for themselves, or enjoying, with their possessions, the privilege of society. *Here*, was a kind of theocracy; and the power given to members of churches, or rather taken by them, enabled them to build partition walls. The petitions

[86] See Note 86.

ancestor of Bishop Hobart—that sad man, who, like his descendant, was bold and would speak his mind—Remember this, New England, that the day has been, when your purest patriots "were so waspish, that they might not be petitioned." Savage's Winthrop, ii. 255.

of Robert Child, Maverick, and others, mark the character of men and of the times."* These petitioners, says Hutchinson, "prayed that civil liberty and freedom might be forthwith granted to all truly English, and that all members of the Church of England or Scotland, [i. e. Presbyterians, as well as Episcopalians!] not scandalous, might be admitted to the privileges of the churches of New England; or, if these civil and religious liberties were refused, that they might be freed from the heavy taxes imposed upon them, and from the impresses made of them, or their children, or servants, into the war."†

And what could be more modest or harmless as a request, or what more equitable as an alternative, if the request must be denied? Denied of course we expect to find it, however intolerable such a denial, if made to themselves by a crowned head. But one would hardly expect even Puritans to take four good calendar months, as Mr. Greenwood assures us they did,‡ to concoct a bitter refusal. Nor then should we have supposed such modest and lowly applicants for legislative relief, in the constitutional and respectful shape of a petition, could, by Mr. Bancroft's logic, be converted into factionists and rebels. Yet such was the literal fact. As Dr. Morse says, they were disturbers of the public peace, whatever their rank or station. To open the mouth, though never so blandly, against a Puritan Establishment, was rank sedition. He who ventures it, must be gagged with a fine, or soldered up in a prison. The sanctuary of a private letter shall not save him: that very letter shall be opened, to find new crimes, and furnish keener accusations.§

All this, too, when, as Mr. Felt says, (with as small a sense of the mischiefs of juxtaposition as they themselves

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, ix. 47.

† Hist. Mass. i. 137.

‡ Hist. King's Chapel, p. 6.

§ Hutch. Hist. i. 138, 139.

had,) during this very year (1646) they were remonstrated with from England in favor of Anabaptism and Presbyterianism; and when the General Court actually appointed a committee, to frame anew some of their laws, in order to let autocratical England know "THEIR UTTER DISAFFECTION TO ARBITRARY GOVERNMENT!" I compare Mr. Felt's sensibility to theirs, because, while they thus outraged these harassed yet temperate remonstrants, and in the next breath avowed their horror of tyranny, *he* mentions this horror to their praise; and then, with all calmness, goes on to show how, among other enormities, they fine people five shillings for absence from Puritan worship, and forty shillings a month for disloyalty to a Puritan Establishment, and doom rebellious children to a violent and ignominious death!*

Who, in view of such spots on Puritan character, as much out of place as the spots on Laocöon's priestly robes, when defiled *sanie atroque veneno,* can expect a commentator to be as cool as an astronomer describing the chequered surface of the moon? If these men lacked sense or reason, we might dismiss them with a sigh. If they were wise, like the children of light, for heaven only, we might drop the tear of pity on their aberrations. But it is the boast of their eulogists, (see the close of Mr. Baylies' Plymouth,) that in the wisdom of this world, they, and their descendants, have been among the foremost.† And yet such men denounce tyranny, and then exemplify it! loathe an act of tyranny, as their utter abhorrence, and then "shoot out their arrows, even bitter words," after four months sharpening, against petitioners for the rights of conscience! Willingly would one call this, as Belknap did Hutchinson's impartiality, but inattention. But who

* Felt's Salem, pp. 172–176.

† They had a fairer opportunity to hit right, as Hubbard says, "than ever men had in many ages past." New England, p. 181.

can dispraise such heads, to exonerate such hearts? The cool, grave, marble self-possession of the Puritans, when defending themselves, and of their advocates when lauding them for exquisite conscientiousness, compels one, when not provoked to smiles by it, to think it would be displayed to no ill advantage on the steps of the pillory.

"We honor his Majesty," says Deputy Leet, "but we have tender consciences."* And so he was to obey him when he pleased, and set him at naught when he preferred; and all the while act under his Majesty's authority! And must men look as demure as if just from Trophonius's oracle, before logic the like of this? Must they have even Hudibras thrown at royalists,† and never be allowed to say, Hudibras has cut both ways, and described the non-conformist too? If a tender conscience may disobey the authority which gives it power to do any ministerial act, and plead the sanction of such authority when convenient to its interests, must the satirical poet never tread upon its hallowed ground? Is he an absolute blasphemer, because he boldly says of the Puritan,

> "His slippery conscience has more tricks
> Than all the juggling empirics?"

Is a man, like L'Estrange, to be pronounced a slanderer, because he says, "They make their consciences like skittish jades, that boggle at their own shadows, and start into a precipice to avoid a feather?"‡ And if we come down to our own days, are we guilty of atrocious libelling, if we discover something of this skittishness, transmitted, like an inborn *chorea Sancti Viti*, to Mr. Bancroft? For, on p. 348, vol. i., Mr. B. declares the Puritans were no bigots; and then, on his next pages, proceeds to give their bigoted

* Hutch. Collect. p. 337. † Upham's Vane, p. 323.
‡ Holy Cheat, p. xii. 3d edit. 1662.

persecution of the Browns. On p. 458, he finishes his narrative of the awful castigations of the Quakers; and forthwith speaks of toleration, as hovering like a dove at the window of the Ark of Safety.* Then, on p. 463, he says he will never apologize for Puritan excesses; and, forsooth, the ink hardly escapes his pen, before he indites another clause, in which he glorifies these excesses, and almost spans them with an overarching rainbow.

But such argument upon the case some will think quite too tempting to severity; and, to allay their fears, I will leave unsaid far stronger things than I have uttered, and abruptly close this letter.

LETTER X.

We have now reached, in this sketch of the demeanor of Puritanism towards Episcopacy in New England, the days of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate of Cromwell. Then, of course, Episcopacy was in dark abeyance, both in the colonies and at home. In New England, it was emphatically dumb and friendless: "there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped." (Isa. x. 14.) Then, too, the Anabaptist, the Gortonist, the Quaker, the Seeker, the any body and every body, who might have dared to question Puritan Supremacy and Infallibility, in Church or State, was harried out of the land, or awed into submission by that formidable law, which threatened death to any

* Is it possible he can have forgotten the sufferings of the Quakers, *long after* the time, when, as he would insinuate, toleration had blessed them?

one who should attempt—aye, attempt merely, the change of any essential feature of the government.*

Massachusetts was now drawing round herself a *cordon sanitaire*, as exclusive as that of the iron dictator of Paraguay, Dr. Francia. No one was permitted to entertain a stranger, who should arrive with intent to reside, or allow the use of any habitation, without liberty from the standing council!† None, therefore, could come within her borders, but such as her sovereign will approved. All who talked to her of changes in her autocracy, did so at the consummate peril of never talking again to human ears! And now, said she in her heart, like mystic Babylon, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." (Rev. xviii. 7.) And having effectually barred out all intruders, she commenced the work of internal reformation, with an unsparing hand. "From the year 1650 to the Restoration," says Mr. Chalmers, "Massachusetts, was chiefly employed in a business, that of all others seems to have been most congenial to it; in preserving, by persecution, uniformity in opinion and discipline."‡ Then indeed did she make Boston a second Rome, and the head-quarters of Congregational Popery. Fortunately, however, the kingdom,§ and the greatness of the kingdom, under these western heavens, was not to remain in her possession for a full quarter of a century. Power shifted hands at home; and she who yesterday said, by the lips of her favorite Governor, (Endicott,) "Unless you change your religion, you die," could to-day fawn upon

* The law may be seen in Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vii. 233.—By it they came near taking the life of the Churchman, Edward Randolph, whom Mather curses so heartily in his "Remarkables," p. 107. See Eliot's Dict. pp. 402, 403.

† Chalmers, p. 165. Savage's Wint. i. 224.

‡ Chalmers, p. 189.

§ It should be remembered that New England was called a "kingdom" by the Long Parliament. Hutch. Hist. i. 110.

a monarch, whom in her secret soul she hated and despised. What a cringing letter was that which this very man had to send to England, when Massachusetts was likely to hear the fatal question, *Quo warranto,* for her unseemly violence towards the poor Quakers and other heretics! This is the abject language with which it closes: "With the religious stipulation of our prayers, we, prostrate at your royal feet, beg pardon for this our boldness, craving finally that our names may be enrolled among your Majesty's most humble subjects and suppliants."*

But let these matters pass. Of the period when they occurred, it comports not with my object to speak particularly. Still there are two points in Puritan history, which may well enough be brought up here, to fill a chasm before we again behold Puritan tempers in direct collision with the claims of Churchmen.

The first of them is a very common mistake, in attributing the emigration of the Puritans altogether to the severities of Ap. Laud; and the second is, that if a king had secret fears of the aspirations of Massachusetts after independence, it is no very strange thing, for, to my mind, Cromwell probably had the same. The mistake above alluded to is very easily illustrated by dates. The emigration of Robinson to Holland took place in 1608 or 1609. The emigration to Plymouth in 1620, and the emigrations to Salem, &c. in 1629 and 1630. These three epochs give us the foundations of Puritanism, at the principal dates of its history out of England. No one, of course, will understand me to say, that there were not emigrations in other years; but these are focal points, around which the events of those years cluster.

And now (will it be believed?) William Laud was not an archbishop, at even the latest of these dates. He did

* Hutch. Collect. p. 329.

not succeed to Canterbury until 1633, when Puritanism had had a fair start on this soil of its predilections. But who was Ap. of Canterbury, all this while, when Puritanism was so alienated from its natal home, that it was flying any where, and every where, to "the outside of the world?" George Abbot, who was a rigid Calvinist, and professedly almost an object of Puritan adoration. "One favorite principle of his government," says Mr. Le Bas, "was liberality and moderation towards the men, whose consciences were afflicted by the ordinances and ceremonies of the Church." And again, "He was almost the idol of that party, who were incessantly complaining of the iron yoke of necessity."* [87]

Now the phrase, "Laudean persecution," is notorious on the pages of Puritan historians, orators, and essayists; and if it could be rhymed to, would be as much so on the pages of Puritan poets. Nevertheless, it may fairly be doubted, whether one in a thousand of their descendants is aware of the fact, that the emigration of the Puritans commenced under the administration of an Archbishop, whom they professed to admire, reverence, love, and almost worship, and whose Calvinism was as rigorous as their own. But such is the plain fact. Puritanism forsook England, and established itself comfortably here, before Laud was at the ecclesiastical helm:—at Plymouth indeed, (the only spot of its pilgrimage according to Mr. Young,) before he was so much as a bishop any where. He was not the Archbishop, however, till 1633;† and then the Puritans had begun to

[87] See Note 87.

* Life of Laud, p. 170.

† And O, most memorable, there was no such thing as trial by jury in Massachusetts, till the year after!—Chalmers' Revolt of the Colonies, i. 47. In the Colony of New Haven, such a thing as a trial by jury was not known till a much later date—say 1655, at the very least. Kingsley's Hist. Discourse, pp. 33, 34.

The learned professor, whom I refer to for authority, calls the gov-

practice his own severities on the Browns and the Vassalls, who thought *their* churchmanship as tall as that of his Grace at Lambeth. Curious, most curious, coincidence! At the very moment there was *one* Laud in England, in New England you might have found twenty! Laud, too, could write *against* Popery, *after* he had become a bishop; while Master Cotton could write *in favor* of two of its loftiest tenets, 'The Power of the Keys,' and the 'Bloody Tenet' of persecution, *after* he had become a Puritan! First look on this picture, and then on that.

The second point with which I proposed filling the chasm in New England Episcopal history, relates to some passages of seeming affection, between Cromwell and a commonwealth not indisposed to imitate his own *penchant* for absolute sovereignty.

Cromwell had seen some of the precious spirits, which had had a New England tutoring, in the persons of Harry Vane and Hugh Peters; and doubtless he inferred, that the "succession" would not be interrupted, and some of his plans be foiled. He was anxious, therefore, to find some suitable safety-valve for the dissipation of New England steam, should it prove so troublesome as it had done in the person of Harry Vane. Now it is an actual fact, that twice during his Protectorate, Cromwell tried to draw off settlers from New England, and plant them in Ireland and in Jamaica.* And he assailed them with his characteristic cunning, on their weakest side, that of ecclesiastical self-consequence.† God, said he, has promised that his people shall be the head and not the tail. But a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush; and Cromwell met his match. The

ernment, notwithstanding, by the complimentary term "simple." I could point him out one quite as "simple," viz., an absolute monarchy with the Inquisition for its court.

* Holmes' Annals, i. 307. Hutch. Hist. i. 175, 450.

† Chalmers' Annals, p. 236.

reply of the Puritans to the project of settlement in Ireland, may be found in the appendix of Hutchinson's History, vol. i. 450. They there tell him, with a tact parallel to his own, "Although we verily believe that your honor aims at the glory of God, and the welfare of his people, yet (with favor) we conceive it will tend to the contrary, for the following reasons."*

I well know that a very different construction has been put upon Cromwell's conduct, towards the Colony of Massachusetts. Those who choose will put a construction on it, which seems more apposite than mine. Their right is equal to mine in doing so. But my right is equal to theirs, in reading the Protector's conduct as I do; and, to me, his repeated anxiety to drain Massachusetts, is not a very striking testimony of his affection for its permanent well-being. And, somehow or other, when I see him and Puritans bandying back and forth their characteristic religious compliments, a fit of incredulity comes over me, unbidden.[88] But be all this as it may, we must leave Cromwell and his contemporaries playing at foils, to attend to the destinies of Episcopacy in New England, after the Commonwealth at home had shrunk away before royalty, at a tired people's bidding.

When reviewing the ecclesiastical history of Massachusetts, up to the period which is about to be contemplated, Gov. Hutchinson makes the following remarkable declarations: "He that did not conform was deprived of more civil privileges, than a nonconformist is deprived of by the test in England." And again, on the same page, "Nor was there any Episcopal church, in any part of the Colony, till the charter was vacated."†

[88] See Note 88.

* Chalmers' Revolt of the Colonies, i. 91. Chalmers confirms Hutchinson.

† Hist. i. 380. So also in Farmer's Belknap, i. 43. Prof. Kingsley

But in 1664, not long after the Restoration of Charles II., and just before the death of Endicott, a change came over the fortunes of Puritanism, as over those of Nebuchadnezzar in days of old. The time had been, as with that haughty monarch, when, whom it would it slew, and whom it would it kept alive; when, whom it would it set up, and whom it would it put down. And so, like him, because its mind was hardened in pride, it was deposed from its kingly throne. (Daniel, v. 19, 20.) It is a remarkable fact, that when its power was mightiest, and most autocratical, when it was minting its own coin, and putting heretics to death, that *then* the decree went forth, "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it." In the fullness of its sufficiency it was brought to straits. Massachusetts, who yesterday, as it were, had scorned and flouted, fined and imprisoned petitioners for the rights of conscience, is compelled to-day to listen to a rebuke, to which she dared not reply, but as a "most humble subject and suppliant!" It was of course useless to remonstrate, as an inferior, with those, whose chief grievance at home had been, that their own remonstrances had been disregarded. A voice from the Throne itself was all which could reach the auditory nerves of those, who, to any thing that was not palatable, were like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ears. That voice, however, came at last: as welcome as the roar of a New England sea-beach, presaging an eastern storm. But it must be heard. Yes, it *must* be heard. Those who loved dictation,* as well as what a Plymouth governor styled "good trucking stuff," were at last compelled to hear from a source, resentment

would fain have us believe the contrary. Hist. Disc. pp. 48, 49. Belknap and Hutchinson are too respectable, with Puritans themselves, for him to gainsay. Hutchinson also admits, that their civil laws "were more sanguinary than the English laws." A most important authority; for he was a lawyer and a judge. Hutch. Hist. i. 388.

* Greenwood's King's Chapel, p. 11.

against which was paralyzed by the ague of apprehension, language such as this: "That such as desire to use the Book of Common Prayer be permitted to do so, without incurring any penalty, reproach, or disadvantage; it being very scandalous, that any persons should be debarred the exercise of their religion, according to the laws and customs of England, by those who were indulged with the liberty of being of what profession or religion they pleased."*

The same language had been used by King Charles in 1662; and finding that in respect to this, as well as other matters, the minds of his distant, "most humble subjects and suppliants" needed stirring up, by way of remembrance, he sent over four commissioners to enliven their recollections. One of these commissioners was Samuel Maverick, a son of one of the unfortunate seven, who petitioned so vainly, and worse than vainly, in 1646. Unquestionably there was something pointed in this, as there was in part of the King's language: the use, *e. g.*, of the word *scandalous;* which had so often resounded from Puritan tongues, when ringing the tocsin for the downfall of the Church of England. The royal wit determined, no doubt, to hurl back upon them some of their own weapons; having discovered that, to all anti-puritanic heretics, their quiver had been an open sepulchre. (Jer. v. 16.)

It may be asked, with no little curiosity, how the jerkins of the Puritans bore pricking with the points of their own arrows. Sorely and sullenly enough; yet resent such an infliction, on the representatives of sarcastic majesty, they could not. But ill-temper always finds an object in one beneath us, when it has not courage to assail those above. The Puritans had sent Simon Bradstreet and John Norton, (*ut modo*, a mixture of the magistrate and the minister—of church and state,) as their agents to England, to represent

* Hutch. Hist. i. 219.

themselves as entirely loyal, to remove all scandals and objections which might arise against them, to preadvise them of coming storms, and finally, and above all, to do nothing, and to let nothing be done prejudicial to the precious Charter, which had been transported from England, for more than thirty years, and was resigned, at last, with the profoundest sighs.*

Bradstreet and Norton had gone, sorely against their wills; for they anticipated no great success, and they knew too well, by past experience, what awaited them at home, if their mission failed. Now it did not fail. They undoubtedly performed their utmost. They obtained an answer from the king, "kinder to them, and more respectful to their charter and liberties, than they had reason to expect."† Yet, ill-starred answer! it "touched the sore point of their ecclesiastical peculiarities and prejudices,"‡ required them to grant as a *concession*, what themselves had once demanded as a *right*, freedom "tender consciences." And, therefore, the embassy which brought it became fatally unlovely. A plague spot was discovered in it, which could never be forgiven or forgotten. Both its instruments were disowned, discountenanced, and most cuttingly reviled; so that one of them sunk into dreary melancholy, and was hurried by apoplexy into a premature and unhonored grave.§ Dr. Dwight, in his Sermons on the Commandments, must have classed such a death, had he noticed it, among murders. I, however, shall not presume to say that the hapless emissary, whom the Quakers thought a victim of God's judgments for his cruelties to them,|| came to his end as criminally as if poignarded by an assassin. Still, in the eyes of One, who looks upon the hater of his brother as a murderer,

* Snow's Boston, p. 197.
† Greenwood's King's Chapel, p. 7.
‡ Ibid. p. 8.
§ Hutch. Hist. i. 205.
|| Ibid. i. 205, note.

there may be little difference between dying under execrations or a dagger.

It may be supposed that the strong language of King Charles, sustained and enforced by his Commissioners, introduced Episcopacy into Massachusetts without further difficulty. But the fact was altogether otherwise. The Colony fought the King and his agents, most strenuously. What with quibbles, evasions, and postponements, and, as the King himself said in his letter to the Plymouth Colony, "their refractoriness,"* and the Charter for a rampart, they kept the contest up till 1684, when the Charter itself became a nullity under the sentence of an English court. Even in 1670, (during this interval,) we find Roger Williams taunting them with unabated hostility to the Common Prayer Book, as, if tolerated, the inlet, in their view, to abominations without end.†

In 1686, however, the Charter which had been their Palladium, and the preciousness of which ought to have deterred them from "evident partiality to the Revolution which overthrew"‡ the friend that granted it—the Charter, their all in all for more than half a century, was formally wrested from their hands. True, they tried to hide and save it.§ But, concealment or resistance were alike fruitless; and a royal President, with an Episcopal clergyman in his train, at last entered the harbor of the capital of Puritanic Massachusetts.

Graphically does Mr. Greenwood open this inauspicious era, in the romance of New England history. "The Rose Frigate must have seemed to the greater part of the Bostonians, or Bostoneers, as Randolph called them, *freighted heavily with woe*, bearing as it did the Rev. Robert Rat-

* Hutchinson, i. 466. † Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, i. 281.

‡ Felt's Salem, p. 203.

§ Hutch. Hist. i. 308. Chalmers' Revolt, i. 113.

cliffe * of the Church of England, with his surplice and his Book of Common Prayer; to say nothing of the commission, which appointed a president over them by the king's sole authority,"† Probably the celebrated dark day which came in the same spring month, about a century later, with its evening and night perfectly Egyptian,‡ did not surpass the day which brought a cargo so redolent of heresy and horrors.

But it is not my purpose here to enter into full particulars; for I am writing memoranda, and not a narrative. Greenwood's history of King's Chapel, Boston, will give a Churchman the most important facts; and the glosses on them he can make allowance for, or substitute his own. The history of Harvard University, by President Quincy, will also not be without its value to the student and the annalist. Neither he nor Mr. Greenwood has any sympathies with Calvinism; and where Calvinism might have thrown a mantle over its own frailties, they lift the curtain with a steady hand. Still if they love Calvinism less, they do not love Episcopacy more; and where the prejudices of the Puritans against Episcopacy merely come under their review, we must expect them to be less resolute. With these hints, Greenwood and Quincy may be consulted safely.

Among the incidents, which show how vehemently the Puritans resented the introduction of Episcopacy into their strong hold, (Boston,) may be mentioned the following. Mr. Ratcliffe was denied the use of a Puritan pulpit; a library-room was the only place which could be obtained for his ministrations. This is a fact convenient enough to remember, when Congregationalists of the present age com-

* "Mr. Ratcliffe," says John Dunton in his journal, "was an eminent preacher, and his Sermons were useful and well-dressed." Dunton was a nonconformist bookseller, then on a visit to New England. See the Extract from "Dunton's Life and Errors," in Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, ii. 106.

† Greenwood's King's Chapel, p. 15. ‡ Felt, p. 507.

plain that Episcopal pulpits are not open to them. It may be remembered, too, that this was done, as we now do the same, for *conscience' sake:* so that upon this subject, we and their ancestors are in perfect harmony. If the consciences of their descendants are more limber, I know not that they should very querimoniously urge that we imitate their ancestors rather than themselves. We verily believe that, right or wrong, their ancestors, conscience-wise considered, were better men than they are. Do they not believe this too? Then why do they chant their praises, with thanksgiving and the voice of melody?

But not pulpits only were denied Episcopalians. They could not enjoy the mercy of a bell-ringing, to call them to their prayers, and this for the same substantial cause: it would be "intrenching on *their* liberty of conscience."* Now this was particularly severe, (unless perhaps the first Episcopalians of New England were a sort of Puseyites;)† for the favor was not asked for on a Lord's Day, when it might perhaps disturb their sabbatical tranquillity. The bell was solicited for Wednesday and Friday morning prayers, at nine o'clock; when nothing could have been interfered with, but possibly some snug bargain. But no, it was against their conscience still; though in hours supremely secular. They could not conscientiously help a Churchman to his prayers, even upon a common week-day; though it would have been perfectly easy, from the situation of the library, to have kept carts rumbling beneath his windows, while he was trying to recall his thoughts, and direct them heavenward amid life's bustle. I do not say that carts were sent there, for that unchristian purpose; but I am free to say my full belief is, not a Puritan truckman among them all would have travelled from his path, one hair's breadth,

* Quincy, i. 357.

† They had no pews, e. g. in their church.—Snow's Boston, p. 192.

to allow the Liturgy to be joined in with less distraction.[89]" And is this severe? Why, how could less have been expected, when, as Mr. Greenwood tells us, the Puritan ministers of Boston railed "in their pulpits against the English Liturgy, in terms which few ministers would now use of the prayers of the most degraded heathen;" when Puritans, if they happened to be executors to a Churchman, would not allow the service of his own Prayer Book to be said over his dead body, and would absolutely interrupt and stop a clergyman if he attempted such an act of charity;[90] and when, finally, they denounced any curious inquirer among themselves, who should dare venture to hear a syllable of truth from an Episcopal pulpit, as a rank apostate.*

And this perhaps is quite enough to show, what the Church had to encounter on Puritan soil, even with a royal governor, disposed to countenance and sustain it. Its circumstances could not be comfortable, and required for their endurance bold and hearty resolution. Happily the early Churchmen of Boston were blessed with this, as President Quincy somewhat sarcastically confesses. "Although they were few in number, poor in revenue and resources, and discountenanced by all the predominating colonial powers, yet their proceedings indicate a spirit sufficiently lofty and determined. Excluding from their records all recognition of the authorities of Massachusetts, not even referring to the colony by name,† they laid hold of the horns of the transatlantic altar, placed their society under the shadow of the sceptre of the monarch, &c."‡—the same shadow, he does

[89] See Note 89. [90] See Note 90.

* Kings' Chapel, pp. 30, 42, 27.

† Curious! Did not Pres. Quincy know that the Puritans treated the king just so?

‡ Quincy, i. 356.

not add, in which the Charter, dear as heart's blood, delighted to luxuriate.

Still, with spirits firm as Plymouth rock sturdiness, the Churchmen of New England had a severe struggle for a bare existence; as an extract from an address to King William, who granted the Charter of 1691, effectually illustrates. Such an address was presented by the Rector and Wardens of King's Chapel, Boston, in behalf of their fellow Episcopalians. In it they say, that they have been "injured and abused, both in their civil and religious concernments, our Church by their rage and fury having been greatly hurt and damnified, and daily threatened to be pulled down and destroyed; our minister hindered and obstructed in the discharge of his duty and office, and we now put under the burthen of most excessive rates and taxes, to support the interest of a disloyal, prevailing party amongst us, who, under pretence of the public good, design nothing but ruin and destruction to us and the whole country."*

This is a sad picture of the condition in which Churchmen found themselves, when the period of the new Charter was about approaching. And it may well be supposed that their case, with that of other "separatists," "new-lights," and "dissenters," was distinctly kept in view, in the provision of that Charter for entire freedom of conscience, for all persons "except Papists." But oh, how reluctantly and parsimoniously did Puritanism deal out to others, that freedom which, to herself, she wished imparted without measure. The new Charter, like the old one, was only influential "as *she* understood it;" according to a system said to be politically fashionable at the present day of improvement. Forty years after this most liberal charter had been bestowed on Massachusetts, (*i. e.* in 1731,) a committee are found re-

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vii. 194.—Another ground of complaint was, that *in print* Episcopacy was called "idolatry and Popery."—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d series, vii. 193.

porting to the legislature on the memorial of Roger Price, Commissary of the Episcopal churches in New England, for a law to relieve Episcopalians, as there had been for Quakers and Baptists.*

King Charles had now gone where wit could not save him, nor profligacy be charged with petulance. James had been obliged to flee. William and Mary had granted the Charter just alluded to, and gone down to that narrow house where they were powerless as the poorest. Anne, too, had come and vanished, and the first George also. The house of Brunswick, then upon the throne, had been ushered in with loud whig thanksgivings. All these changes, with their natural counterpart ones, had taken place; and the world grown older in wisdom, experience, and philanthropy. Even the wretched Quaker, so often blasted with a curse in Puritan canon law, after the fashion of the Trentine Council, (another point of consanguinity between Puritans and Papists,)† was not harried out of the land as formerly. The detested Anabaptist, though by the same law in which Massachusetts showed herself such an adept at cursing, "damnably heretical," had found a corner to skulk in, and by stealth had raised a small house, wherein to worship God after the dictates of his conscience.‡

And now, again, just about an entire century since Episcopacy had first remonstrated against the oppressions of Puritanism, its best hater, according to President Quincy;§

* Felt's Salem, p. 397.

† See Ancient Col. Laws, pp. 120–126.—Plymouth Col. Laws, p. 127. In Connecticut, there was a statute against cursing any body, under which her curses would have cost Massachusetts six shillings apiece! Connecticut Laws, p. 195, edit. 1769. By the Massachusetts law of 1746, her own curses should have cost her *eight* shillings; or, if moderate, but *four*. New Haven cursed the Quakers too. Morse's Geography, pp. 237, 238.

‡ Snow's Boston, p. 151. Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, iii. 259.

§ Harv. Univ. i. 351.

though, as he admits, it both concealed its hatred, and told falsehoods about it, when interest made them necessary—about a century, I say, from its earliest remonstrance, Episcopacy again lifts its voice for a Puritan boon. A petition is offered, praying that exemptions may be granted Episcopalians, similar to those which had been granted—whom? And must it be believed! these very Quakers and Anabaptists? Yea, even these, once "cursed" and "damnable" as they were, are freed from that tax which was considered the most oppressive of burdens in England—the payment of tithes—while Churchmen are ground by it still![91] And that, too, when really tithes are not an imposition of the Government, but an annuity entailed upon private property, by private individuals, the owners of that property, and Government has nothing of concern in them, any more than in a last will and testament; save so far as it executes the wishes of the donor, who, of course, has a sovereign right to tax his own estate in any lawful way he pleases! And that, too, when Puritan taxes were not the tithes of individuals upon property of their own, but the direct taxes of the Government for its own sake, like imposts to raise a revenue!* And that too, finally, when, but for the intercessions of the Primate of all England and Metropolitan, (the successor of the vilified Laud, and whom regret for Laud's Puritanical sternness seems to have stirred up to extraordinary kind efforts for Massachusetts,) the Charter under which Massachusetts then acted, had never, perhaps, been obtained! Ap. Tillotson was a favorite with William III., was the clerk of the closet for him, i. e. his confidential chaplain. And Dr. Mather, the agent of Massachusetts, candidly acknowledges that, at *his* desire, the Arch-

[91] See Note 91.

* Sometimes, perhaps, they were tithes; but that would make them as bad as England. Neal's New England, ii. 367.

bishop did "often concern himself to do kind offices for the country, and pray both the king and queen to put marks of their favor on their faithful subjects there, [in Massachusetts,] and once he went so far as to tell the king, *It would by no means do well for him, to take away any of those privileges from the people of New England, which King Charles I. had granted them.*"*

O can it be in any wise a possibility! an Archbishop of Canterbury, supplicating for the preservation of a charter, they had moved heaven with prayers and fastings, and earth with agents, petitions, fees, flatteries,† presents, bribes—nay threats and rebellion, in order to retain? Why, it were enough to wipe out all the sins of Churchmen, down to this very hour. But, grievous contrast! a charter of smaller compass, is employed to vex them still; and a writer, who, on any other subject, would weep over sufferings for the sake of principle—even such an one extenuates the tyranny, because, forsooth, the Episcopal churches in New England were then few in number!‡

Tell it not in Gath! What! a Socinian, ninety-nine hundredths of the writings of whose sect are either contests *for* principles, or *about* them, exculpating an unrighteous taxation—the same sort of imposition, which severed his native country from Great Britain—an imposition for which our Revolution was begun and carried on, through flood and fire, at the free cost of blood and pelf, and all but "sacred honor," and wrought out at length, almost by miracle, to his country's endless joy, (unless it corrupt itself, and grow schismatical against itself, as Puritanism has long since done)—exculpating such an imposition, I say, because

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, ix. 249. The Italics are not mine.

† Increase Mather told King William, that if he would get on the right side of Massachusetts, he might "become the Emperor of America." Mather's Remarkables, p. 123. Bancroft, iii. 79.

‡ King's Chapel, by Greenwood, p. 97, note.

its sufferers were ten, and not a hundred; a thousand, and not a million! Truly one wants Virgil's hundred tongues, hundred mouths, and lungs of iron, to speak long enough, and loud enough, upon such astounding contradictions.

But was the petition for the removal of such an oppressive and ungrateful imposition granted? Granted! why, unless a Puritan could, as President Quincy allows, conceal or deny when policy demanded, it was granted long before. What said Increase Mather, when soliciting Queen Mary's intercessions with her husband for the Charter of 1691? "I doubt," says her Majesty, "there have been differences there, as well as here, about church-government." "In New England," was Mather's unblushing answer, "they are generally those that are called Non-Conformists. *But they carry it with all due respect unto others. We judge some of them to be better men than ourselves!*"* What said Cotton Mather, of Magnalia memory, to ingratiate a British nobleman at court in 1718? "Our lawful, and rightful, and invaluable king George, is not known to have so much *as one*, of all that are *truly of this people*, [Mather's italics] disaffected unto him." And again: "Calvinists with Lutherans, Presbyterians with Episcopalians, Pædobaptists with Anabaptists, beholding one another to fear God and work righteousness, do, with delight, sit down together at the same table of the Lord: nor do they hurt one another in the holy mountain!!"† And yet, he says, on the very next page, he writes nothing but what he knows or thinks to be true; when lo, the law oppressing Quakers and Anabaptists, was not repealed till he was in his grave, (he died Feb. 1728, and the law was repealed June 1728,—Felt's Annals of Salem, p. 386,) and Churchmen cry for mercy, when he

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, ix. 251.

† Ibid. 1st series, i. 105.—Pemberton, who died in 1717, has made just about as rash and incorrect a statement. Yet he was one of their "stars." See his Sermons. London, 1727, p. 258.

had long been dust! How far does all this go to heighten our confidence in the celebrated Magnalia?[92]

But I shall go astray myself—Was the petition granted? It was *answered.* Not indeed with fines and denunciations, as in 1646, but with such a scurvy and stingy grace, that even Mr. Felt has to acknowledge its "restrictions," and the gentle Mr. Greenwood to call it "backward." And it was *granted;* but with such characteristic clemency, that the petitioners had to take refuge in an appeal to the King himself, and complain most strenuously of "the sufferings of Churchmen"—sufferings which Mr. Greenwood, free from all superstition about the Divine Nature, esteems a vindictive punishment of the Divine Will! "What," says he, "What a retribution! Think of the days of Ap. Laud!"

And this is the way, is it, in which sweet Christian charity and courtesy can comment upon the freaks of man's direful spite? they are Heaven's retributions? Why really this is heathenism revived; for the heathen ascribed their own worst passions to Jupiter, and his most ungodlike fellow-deities. It must have been in thoughtlessness that a pen, which has so often advocated sentiments infinitely different, was betrayed into calling a burst of uncharitableness, God's vindicating reminiscence of the days of Ap. Laud.

But taking the sentiment in its worst aspect—allowing the retribution—how easy thus to retort, and say, If the stubbornness of Puritanism, when left to its own control, in this world of *improvement* and *development*, could not abate in near a century; (Laud was put to death in 1645;) if the fires of its vengeance could not go out, in a period when volcanoes themselves grow cool—what, oh what must it have been, in the lifetime of its devoted opposer, whose neck it doomed to the gallows, and at length brought to the block!*

[92] See Note 92.

* Many do not know, probably, that Laud was sentenced to be hung

Well might Laud say, "I most willingly leave the world, being weary at the very heart of the vanities of it, and of my own sins many and great, and of the grievous distractions of the Church of Christ, almost in all parts of Christendom."* Peace to the ashes of the unshrinking sufferer! O what pyramids of praise would the Puritans have piled upon his name, had he but toiled *for* them, and not *against* them! had he perished in behalf of a cause, which employed, without the slightest compunction, the relentless will of an Endicott, or a Bellingham, or the ossified bigotry of a Dudley!

P. S.—Of Endicott I shall elsewhere speak, more fully, as the most violent perhaps of all Puritan persecutors. Yet when he died, Bellingham was put in his place; because, says Hubbard, the Puritans "resolvedly fixed their choice upon such persons, as they judged most likely to maintain the Government, in that same state wherein it hath been heretofore, *without the least alteration* or change."—(N. Eng. p. 582.) A Quaker thus sums up his character and fate. "R. Bellingham, governor, who had been deputy under J. Endicott, and a party with him in all the inhuman severity of his government; but his power of punishing was near its termination, for soon after this he went distracted, and in that state departed this life, the 7th of December in this year"—i. e. 1672, and long after Charles II. had interfered in behalf of the Quakers, and long after the Puritans had *pretended* to modify their laws in their favor.—(Gough's Quakers, iii. 95.)

The Quakers, it thus appears, received more merciful treatment from Episcopal royalty, than from Puritan—what shall I say? Republicanism, they professed it to be; but

as a common felon; and that it was with extreme difficulty he had his sentence commuted for decapitation.—Le Bas's Laud, p. 317.

* His last will. Troubles, p. 457.

Despotism it was, call it by what soft name you will. And as a further illustration of the amenity of England towards the Quakers, Dr. Franklin tells us they were countenanced by Queen Anne, "who of all our crowned heads, since the Revolution, was by far the least favorable to Dissenters."—(Sparks' Franklin, iv. 86.)

LETTER XI.

My object in the three preceding letters, has been to give some general outline, covering a long period, of the treatment of Episcopalians under a Puritan regime. I shall now specify cases with less regard to time or order, to show that not Episcopalians only, but all who were afflicted with that intestine trouble, which hindered Deputy Leet from obeying the king's mandate, (a tender conscience,) found no consideration for such tenderness in the judgment of Puritanism; ever rude and rough, when not deciding in its own behalf. Episcopalians, and all who, like them, were "dissenters," "new lights," or "separatists," to say nothing of the awful words expended on Quakers and Anabaptists, were harassed, burdened, and kept down, by every species of *practicable* vexation and oppression. Puritanism was always shrewd enough; it knew sufficiently well how to be tolerant, when temporal advantages offered a bonus for lenity. Then, like Mather before the Queen, it could judge others not as good only, but even better than its own self. But the penetration of Justice Story has stated, with admirable precision, the law by which its mercy was graduated. "Persecution," says he, "became less frequent, because it was less safe."*

* Miscellanies, p. 66.

The sorest subject to a Puritan, in all the features of the political economy and constitution of England, one would suppose to be a religious establishment, or the union of the Church with the State. At least, one would suppose this, from the language of the Puritans themselves, and that of a host of their partisans. President Quincy, however, (and the importance and candor of his testimony must be my excuse for another allusion to it,) declares, that "an utter detestation of the English hierarchy, Church service, and discipline," "occasioned the emigration to New England."* They could, he admits, cunningly conceal, or brazenly deny "this antipathy," though one of their "master passions;" and this no doubt is the grand secret to explain, why much of Puritan vituperation of England seems political rather than religious—seems levelled against the Government, rather than the Church. They were guided by the same cautious policy, which, as Justice Story affirms, directed them in the matter of persecution. It was "less safe," at times, to avow their ultimate ecclesiastical aims; and then they disguised them under the armor of political warfare.

All this was highly ingenious, but we must notwithstanding assume, on Puritan authority, that the union of Church and State is one of the worst of Romish abominations. And, now, mark Puritanism's proverbial inconsistency. No sooner does it cast off the shackles of an establishment it did not itself manufacture, than it founds one of which, with the temper of Nebuchadnezzar, it could cheerfully say, "Is not this great Babylon which I have builded?" Mr. Felt does not hesitate to speak, in terms, of the bond of union between Church and State in Massachusetts, which, at the date of 1664, had existed "for more than thirty years," i. e. from the very outset! † "Church and State," says President Quincy, in his Centennial Address, "were very *curiously* and

* Harv. Univ. i. 351.

† Annals of Salem, p. 222.

efficiently interwoven with each other." (p. 32.) "To this" very curious, but very efficient piece of mechanism, "they clung as the ark of their safety."* In Hutchinson's Collection of papers, the Puritans can be found speaking of their "present establishment," and their "long and orderly establishment."† Hazard, in his Collections, gives the "ecclesiastical constitution of Massachusetts" in full.‡ The appendix to the Minutes of the Congregational and Presbyterian delegates, clearly illustrates the state of things in Connecticut; where the same curious and efficient mechanism of Massachusetts was so vigorously plied, that, says the annotator, "nor do I find any thing which looks like an act of toleration, till the year 1708."§ And, by the way, it may be added, when Connecticut did allow dissenters, she only allowed "sober" ones, alias silent ones. A philippic against "the standing order," would have been ecclesiastical inebriation; and reminded a bold adventurer, (after Mr. Greenwood's hint,) of the ear-losing days of Bastwick and Prynne.‖

But it would only weary my readers to show more extensively, how the Puritans of New England did not hesitate to recognize their ecclesiastical societies, as *established* by civil government. With them, as with Aristotle about tyranny, the *place* in which they were called on to define an establishment, altered the hue of the thing entirely. Aristotle ¶ pronounced all to be tyrants, who intended their own good, more than that of their dependents; but finding the

* Story's Misc. p. 66. † Hutch. Coll. pp. 359, 361.

‡ Hazard's Coll. i. 488. § Minutes, &c. p. 52.

‖ Note 86 shows Mr. Everett's incorrectness on this subject. Trumbull's Connecticut shows how hard it was for Congregationalists themselves, if they departed at all from the Establishment, to gain any favor. See the celebrated Guilford Case, vol. ii. 114, etc. This, too, as far down as 1729. Connecticut had her Establishment till 1818; Massachusetts had one till 1834.

¶ R. L'Estrange's Æsop, *folio*, p. 460, third edit.

world about his ears, changed his ground, and said that tyrants were a sort of persecutors of old time, who had long been extinct! In England, an establishment was a tyranny; but in New England, according to President Quincy, betokened "a love of independence and political sagacity!"* Behold in what magnificent rhetoric some of the old Puritans themselves could speak of it. Says John Wise of Ipswich, with a confidence which, at this day, could only be thought to emanate from the school of Pusey or Newman: "It is certain that the Church of Christ is the pillar of truth, or sacred recluse, and peculiar asylum of religion; and this scared guest, religion, which came in the world's infancy from heaven, to gratify the solitudes of miserable man, when God had left him, hath long kept house with us in this land, to sweeten our wilderness state, and the renowned churches here are her sacred palaces."†

Having laid the foundation of their Establishment, (the corner stone of which, let it be kept in mind, was not hammered in pieces till 1834!) the Puritans forthwith proceeded to enact the part of those, who wield the energies of an Establishment, not after the laws and usages of centuries, but after the new-born counsel of their individual wills. "Every man, in short," says Mr. Emerson, summing the matter up, "who attempted to act, unfettered by the decrees of the court, and the judgment of the ministers, found himself circumscribed."‡ "The arm of the civil government," in the powerful and unsparing language of Justice Story, "was *constantly* employed in support of the de-

* Cent. Add. p. 32.—See Douglass's Summary, ii. 105, on the Test Act of Massachusetts.

† The Churches Quarrel Espoused, p. 65, published in 1710. A tract against Presbyterian tendencies! Not even a Presbyterian Establishment would answer. It must be Congregationalism, only, which could be "renowned."

‡ First Church, pp. 62, 63.

nunciations of the Church; and without its forms, THE INQUISITION existed in substance, with a *full share* of its terrors and its violence."* And this, notwithstanding their solemn, tremendously solemn adjuration and pledge, "We do bind ourselves, in the presence of God, to walk together in all his ways, according as he is pleased to reveal himself to us, in his Blessed Word of Truth.—*Nor will we deal hardly or oppressingly with any, wherein we are the Lord's stewards.*—And all this, not by any strength of our own, but by the Lord Jesus Christ; whose blood we desire may sprinkle this our covenant in his Name."† This Covenant was drawn up at Salem, Mass., in 1629, and is no doubt the same, literally, which Endicott subscribed, and to which, or a similar one, Bellingham and Dudley subscribed also. And yet no three, in all Puritan history, were more pitiless persecutors! Who can contrast such frightful contradictions, and not think of the language of Jeremiah, "Be astonished O ye heavens at this, and be horribly afraid; be ye very desolate, saith the Lord! For my people have committed TWO EVILS."

I may, and indeed must ramble in such a letter as this; and therefore may here be permitted to add, that while the Establishment of Massachusetts makes Justice Story think of the "Holy and Apostolic COURT of the Inquisition," *some* of the penalties of this Court make a Romanist himself think of INDULGENCES! The penalties alluded to are pecuniary; and, unquestionably, if one chose to pay, he was indulged in disobedience, to the full extent of Puritanical canon law. So it is diverting, perhaps, but neither ridiculous nor untrue, for the Abbe Raynal to say, "But at the same time that amusements were forbidden, equally with vices and crimes, one might be allowed to swear by paying a penalty of one livre, two sols, six deniers; and to break

* Miscell. p. 66. † Neal's New England, i. 127, 128.

the Sabbath for sixty-seven livres, ten sols. Another indulgence allowed was, to atone by a fine for a neglect of prayer, or for uttering a rash oath."*

A Puritan would read this, with a sneer at the Abbe's simplicity; as if such enormities as indulgences were ever practised by his pope-hating forefathers. But if he can tell me the essential difference between saying, 'You may be exempted from the penance due swearing, if you put a shilling into the treasury of the Church'—and 'You may be exempted from the imprisonment or whipping due the same sin, if you put a shilling into the treasury of the Government'—then he may sneer on at his leisure. Or if he change his ground, and say, that in this way I involve the Church of England too, in the guilt of indulgences, I care not. The sin of permitting man to commute by money, for offences against Heaven, is inexcusable and detestable; be it practised by whom it may. But I cannot refrain from adding, on the supposition I am addressing a Puritan, If you are thus willing to allow your forefathers have done no better than the Church of England, then why their separation from her? We detect faults in you, who went off to set that Church an example of the *positive* part of reformation, and when we point them out, the answer is, 'They are your own.' This is indeed a precious justification of schism—'It makes us no worse than those whom we abandon.' Try again: you are still in the mire.

And now let us examine, somewhat more particularly, those fines or indulgences, which Puritanism sanctioned under an Establishment altogether her own.

A fine for absence from Puritan worship was one of the earliest outbreakings of a hatred of establishments, transformed into love and imitation of them. Another was the passage of "compulsory laws," to enforce the payment of

* East and West Indies, v. 181.

"tithes or taxes," for the support of an orthodox and godly ministry.* In 1644, (the practice it will be seen was an early one,) a person by name Briscoe, a tanner, published a book against such statutes. Whereupon the ministers thinking such an "unlearned and unstable" rogue, *fuste potius erudiendum quam argumento*, had him summoned before the magistrates, who soon *curried* him into a better mind. I have used this word, because Hubbard does not like to say precisely how they punished him;† though doubtless they were able, if necessary, to club him with muskets, after the fashion in which poor Oldham was whipped at Plymouth.‡

Thus we see, that notwithstanding the sons of light, in our day, are beginning to discover mankind are children of original virtue and not of original sin, it has been fashionable, of old time, when copying a wrong example, to transcend the pattern. In England a *shilling* was hardship enough, for a man who preferred the rantings § of the conventicle to the sobrieties of the liturgy. But in Massachusetts *five shillings*, and in Plymouth *ten shillings*, was not too severe a mulct on a profane "dissenter."|| He who denied "the country's power to compel any to attend Congregational worship," was fastened by his heels in the stocks.¶ He who kept Christmas, or any Holy-Day of the Church of England's devising, must pay the same penalty which he would do for slighting the Puritanical Establishment.** And it is a curious fact, that Christmas, &c., were legislatively condemned, till fear of the loss of that Charter,

* Hutch. Hist. i. 376, 377. † New England, p. 412.

‡ Baylies, Pt. i. 156.

§ This word is legitimate, for it is sanctioned by Puritan canonical usage. See the word "rantor" in Plym. Col. Laws, pp. 103, 126.

|| Felt's Salem, 175. Hutch. Coll. 418, 419. Plym. Col. Laws, 247.

¶ Felt's Salem, 220. ** Ibid. 203.

which seemed a title to an earthly heaven, induced them to let Holy-Days go scot free!* Puritan penances, while they lasted, must however have been profitable; for Mr. Felt mentions the amount of £169, 10*s.* as inflicted at one time, on those statutory "blasphemous heretics," the followers of Geo. Fox.† And these penances were inflicted on the tongue, or the press, as well as on a dereliction of Puritan prayers. He who reproached a magistrate, or a minister, or circulated, or did not surrender, an unorthodox book, must pay *five* pounds, or *ten* pounds, according to the malignity of his crime.‡ And as woman's tongue was less disposed to lie quiet, under pecuniary impositions, hers must be kept fast in *a cleft stick.*§ The press was put under close censorship, and but one printing office allowed in all the colony.|| The Bible was not read in public religious services, unless accompanied by exposition: thus carrying out the doctrine of Pope Pius IVth's Creed, that to "holy Mother Church" "it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures."¶ Many suppose, by the way, that the objection to the public reading of the Scriptures in Puritan congregations, arose out of a mere antipathy to the practice of the Church of England; which treats them so reverentially, and requires so much of them to be read. Not so. Hutchinson gives the true and exact reason. Puritanism, when genuine, was always higher church than prelacy. It believed in the Bible itself, *with*

* Felt's Salem, pp. 271, 272. † Ibid. 217.

‡ Ancient Col. Laws, pp. 121, 122. § Felt's Salem, p. 118.

|| Felt's Salem, 223.—Neal, in his Puritans, exclaims against the censorship of the Press by Churchmen. Vol. ii. 193, 194. But it was one of the Puritan complaints at Hampton Court, that the Press was not guarded.—Soames' Eliz. pp. 538, 539; Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 183. And as to Puritanism in New England on this subject, see Felt, as above, and Ancient Col. Laws. p. 715.

¶ Hutch. Hist. i. 377.

its own note and comment only; and so does the Pope now. Still, ostensibly, it so detested all which bore a Romish name, that it rebelled against "the Julian style of reckoning time, adopted by Protestant nations," and numbered the very months of the year, as Quakers still do, "by figures and not letters."*

Well might Hutchinson write, "Toleration was preached against as a sin in rulers, which would bring down the judgments of Heaven upon the land."† And well might Belknap write, after him, in more copious terms, "It is too evident from their conduct, that they supposed the power of judging to be in those who were vested with authority; a principle destructive of liberty of conscience, and the right of private judgment, and *big with all the horrors of persecution.* The exercise of such authority they condemned in the high-church party, who had oppressed them in England; and yet such is the frailty of human nature, they held the *same principles* and practised the *same oppressions*, on those who dissented from them."‡

Now to be taxed, *nolens volens*, for the preaching of such doctrine as these extracts indicate, and then to be dragged, *vi et armis*, to hear it, (for as the case of Gorton shows, force could be employed without stint, to march the refractory to the meeting-house; Sav. Wint. ii. 142,) seems approaching rather nearer the maximum of oppression and tyranny, than the asymptote tending to its curve. In preaching, however, we do not discover all which was inflicted on, or denied, our hapless Episcopal ancestors. Laws are historical, to an intelligent observer of legislative action. The law against the observance of "any such day as Christmas, or the like," was passed, according to a memorandum in the Anc. Col. Laws, (p. 119,) in 1651; though Mr. Felt,

* Felt's Salem, pp. 73, 74.

† Hist. i. 75.

‡ Belknap's Biog. ii. 355, 356.

in his Salem, (p. 203,) gives it the date of 1659. It is not very material. The mere passage of such a law shows, that Churchmen had fled from England, during the days of the Commonwealth, and sought refuge in Massachusetts. And it further shows, that it was not enough to deprive such refugees of their home, and their church; they must lose, likewise, all their cheering reminiscences. And to crown the matter, and display as much legislative contempt as possible, for usages of a Church they once esteemed it an honor to call their mother, they put the Christmas-keeper and the blacklegs into the same category, and demand no more penalty of the one, than of the other, but precisely the same of both!* Nay they are not content with that only, but they brand the Christmas-keeper as an imitator of foreign superstitions, as one who dishonors his God, and offends his fellow man! Ah, has the spirit which dictated such animosity all departed? Have not those *who now live* (1845) seen graphically verified the lines of Hudibras,

> Who with more care keep holy-day
> The wrong, than others the right way?

i. e., who would positively take more pains to desecrate Christmas, than others would to reverence it? For myself I can say, that some of the sharpest things, not preached only, but printed, within my own short life, have had the Festival of the Incarnation for their particular target, and that I have known Socinians—yes, Socinians themselves—less bitter against the observance of such a festival, than the reputed followers of John Calvin.†

But it may be said this is a perverted judgment, and

* Ancient Col. Laws, p. 119.

† I say the reputed followers of Calvin, and not Calvin himself; who was more charitable. "Nor will I," he says, "condemn those churches which have other solemn days for their assemblies, provided they keep at a distance from superstition."—Institutes, book ii. chap. 8, sect. 34.

therefore a wholly mistaken one. The law against Christmas was repealed in 1682;* and even an organ was allowed Churchmen, on the very spot where the Browns were persecuted, in 1743. Aye, the first was done to save the old Charter; and verily if they could have retained that by doing so, the Puritans would have kept Christmas, and appointed a bishop, and afterwards treated both as they did King Charles's commands for tolerating the Quakers—by obeying to-day, and reviving old laws to-morrow.† And as to the organ, it could not be erected but after the troublesome, and no doubt stormy process of obtaining a town vote.‡

So it seems Churchmen could not do what they wished, within the walls of their own sanctuary, but by Puritan permission; and this, too, when Puritans had denounced Gov. Andross, for demanding the keys of the Old South in Boston to hold service there: a denunciation in which even the gentle Greenwood joins issue. "It was," he says, "such a deliberate outrage on the common rights of property, to say nothing of conscience and liberty, that we may only wonder that Andross and his abettors, of whom doubtless Randolph was one, suffered no personal violence from the people."§ But Churchmen in Salem, more than half a century afterwards, could not enjoy the use of their own ears, without Puritan legislation. And had they attempted to do so, most speedily would "personal violence" have arrested them, if nothing less had been effectual—their doors have been opened, if necessary, "with axes and hammers"; and their dismembered "devil's bagpipe" stopped from whistling for evermore.[93]

After all apologies, then, it may confidently be stated,

[93] See Note 93.

* Felt's Salem, 271.
† Hazard's Coll. ii. 596, 611.
‡ Felt's Salem, 425.
§ King's Chapel, p. 39.

that the Puritans did not do things of the character specified, for a short period, or under few dissuasives. Indeed it may; for, says Justice Story, (whose free and nervous pages upon this subject, I wish I could quote entire: more especially as I have particular reason for believing, this distinguished jurist, in deference to his auditory, rather understated than overstated his private sentiments,) "In this exclusive policy our ancestors obstinately persevered, against every remonstrance, at home and abroad. When Sir Richard Saltonstall wrote to them his admirable letter,* which pleads with such catholic enthusiasm for toleration, the harsh and brief reply was, 'God forbid our love for the truth should be grown so cold, that we should tolerate errors.'—Yes, the very men who asked from Charles the Second, after his restoration, liberty of conscience and worship for themselves, were deaf, and dumb, and blind, when

* This celebrated letter may be found in Hutchinson's Collection, p. 401. It was addressed to Masters Cotton and Wilson, two of the highest of the Puritanical high-churchmen, and told them, in very plain terms, the effect of their intolerance in England. "These rigid ways have laid you very low in the hearts of the saints." I have been denounced for my remarks on the Puritans, as "a defamer of my forefathers." Sir R. Saltonstall *was* my ancestor, which men of the Cotton and Wilson stamp (thank Heaven) *were not.* I confess to an inheritance of his temper and opinion. The rigid ways of the Puritans ought to lay them low, in the hearts of all saints. And perhaps it is a little of his blood which helps my pen, as I describe them. If such a plea of guilty to the attack of my enemies is what they want, they may make the most of it.

I deem it not inapposite to add, that Sir Harry Vane, (then in England,) in 1645, addressed a letter of not dissimilar purport to Gov. Winthrop; and warned him, lest "the Congregationall way" in Massachusetts "teach its oppugners here to extirpate and roote it out, from its own principles and practice."—Hutchinson's Collect. p. 137.

Goodwin, Nye, Burrows, &c., in England, also rebuked the New England Puritans sharply. See references connected with the next footnote but two.

it was demanded by his commissioners for Episcopalians and others."* Hutchinson shows, that the Puritans adopted opinions which were in England, and by their own brethren, "still judged to be groundless and unwarrantable."† Mr. Bancroft tells us the editor of Winthrop's Journal, (Hon. Mr. Savage,) read to him unpublished ‡ letters, "which prove that the Puritans in England were amazed, as well as alarmed, at the boldness of their brethren in Massachusetts."§

Notwithstanding, as early as 1637, more than fourscore opinions are branded, to quote the language of subsequent statutes of law of which they were the primary foundation, as "notorious impieties," and "damnable heresies."|| The laws of the Church became so fearfully and utterly the laws of the State, that "five sixths of the Colony were disfranchised by the influence of the ecclesiastical power."¶ The chapter on heresies, in the Ancient Charters, &c., spreads over nearly *seven* large and close octavo pages; and is, I suppose, like most of the book, but a selection and digest. As it there stands, with the usual self-consistency of the sect whose sentiments it represents, it is contradicted and condemned by the prefaces to its first and final sections. It sets out with admitting, that no human power is lord over the faith and conscience of men, and may not constrain them to believe: and then casts "firebrands, arrows and death" at every thing, which, being "opposite received opinions in practices of the godly," becomes *ex officio* "blasphemous." It is somewhat unfortunate, that this statute was not framed in better keeping, by adding to the declaration "no human power is lord over the conscience," the old clause of exception, duly amended thus, *salva fide*,

* Story's Misc. p. 65. † Hist. i. 80.

‡ Why are these letters kept from public view? Would they be read too eagerly by Episcopalians, or afford troublesome quotations? Compare Savage's Wint. ii. 269.

§ Vol. i. 344, note. || Story's Misc. p. 66. ¶ Ibid. p. 66.

et salva ecclesia Puritanica. And in fact I believe the due exception may be found there; though, as often in the writings of the school of Loyola, under a disguise which it requires penetration to detect. It is indeed, and the whole of it, in a petty monosyllable. On closer examination, I find the preamble to section thirteenth reading thus: "Though no human power be lord over ALL the faith and conscience of men." Now we have the idea in full; and it gives a Puritan seeming credit for liberality, and yet sanctions just those acts of persecution, which would suit his taste. Human power is not lord over *all* the faith of men; but it is lord over a *part* of it, and precisely that part of it, which a Puritan would determine to control.* I give this to my readers, as a specimen of the ingenuity of Puritanic legislation. It is doubtless one of those *curious* but *efficient* interweavings of Church and State, alluded to by the Honorable President of Harvard University.†

As to Fast days, because perhaps mince-pie and custard were then eschewed, there is no specific law against them; yet it somewhat curiously happened that Good Friday, a day for which Puritans cared nothing, was the day when Sir Edmund Andross forced his way into the Old South, Boston; and it becomes therefore a day quite memorable in American Church history, as the first when Episcopal services were heard within Puritanic walls.‡ No doubt, Good Friday, or any other day likely to give prominence to the Liturgy of the Church of England, had it not been

* Just so the Pope has the art of making his official documents have a meaning of greater or less latitude, to please himself. For example, his bull against Elizabeth. Romish Fox and Sectarian Firebrands, pp. 135, 136.

† And again, *ut quondam,* for a Popish parallel. The King of France intended to allow liberty of conscience; but, nevertheless, he would have but *one* religion in his realms.—Smedley's France, ii. 46, Eng. edit.

‡ King's Chapel, p. 39.

thought advisable to repeal the statute against Christmas for the Charter's sake, would soon have fallen under proscription, and been ruled out of the docket of Christian observances. And on second thought, and new examination, I am satisfied it was denounced; for the law includes not Christmas Day alone, but "the like": and this must mean the like holy-day, not the like festival, for it proceeds to say, that all are guilty on such days, not for "feasting" only, but for "forbearing labor."

So, then, doubtless, it was superstitious, and dishonorable to God, and offensive to man, to forbear labor and fast, in commemoration of the day when the great work of redeeming a world was "finished," through chastisement borne by the very Son of God. But nothing could be more lawful or appropriate, than to fast for "the prevalence of Antichrist in reformed [not Papal it will be observed] churches beyond the seas," for "Episcopal usurpation," and "to gain the favor of the King, and the continuance of charter privileges;" i. e., with old consistency, it was right to fast in order to pull the King's Church about his ears, and alike right to fast, that his favor might be propitiated!* It was "an evil and a bitter thing" to take such notice of a miserable earthly monarch, as to pray for his health, long life, &c., according to the Liturgy. Rebellion against him, as we shall presently see, was obedience to God. Still, when, as Mr. Quincy says,† "for protection against foreign powers, a Charter from the parent State was necessary," such a Charter was a transcendent boon, and for that, as in duty bound, they might "ever pray." And further, though to contemn royalty was so far forth to be magnanimous; yet, if royalty would only lend its troops when they were wanted, any mortification and fasting would be undergone to insure their victory, and the heartiest thanksgiving indulged, if vic-

* Felt's Salem, pp. 216, 221, 262. † Cent. Add. p. 23.

tory, though drenched in blood, could perch upon their banners.* In truth, if by one such victory, the blood of as many Papistical Frenchmen could have been spilt, as of Huguenots at the massacre of St. Bartholomew, it may fairly be believed, the Puritans, like Gregory XIII., would have sung praises, fired cannon, and coined medals.†

In England, to talk like Martin Marprelate of those "petty popelings," the bishops, and to experience therefor the discipline of the Court of High Commission, was to suffer martyr-like for doing God service. In New England, to speak irreverently of the "Lord's anointed ministers," was to hazard the *lively* consideration of some fifteen lashes, or the ensobering atmosphere of a dungeon.‡ And this, too, when the offender was a woman, (unless the *cleft stick* were the alternative,) and when incest met with no heavier retribution.§ All, however, which could be said on this side the water, against ministers of Church of England origin, was two-fold more pardonable: it was rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongue by Puritanic epicures. "It would seem," says Mr. Boucher, an ear and an eye witness, "that in these men religion exhausts itself in profession: the more they have of it in their mouths, the less charity there is in their hearts. Against the ministers of the Established Church, their censures are particularly sharp and severe: in their harangues, they are liberal only in bestowing on our whole order the coarse epithets of venal and corrupt hirelings, carnal-minded and ungodly teachers."|| Let, however,

* Felt's Salem, 453, 455, *et alibi.*

† Smedley's France, ii. 35. Gifford's France, iii. 285.

‡ No whipping, however, is inflicted for blaspheming the Queen.—Sav. Wint. ii. 10, 11. And when honest Thomas Parker, one of their own ministers, would not denounce the bishops as hard as they did, he is forthwith denounced himself.—Eliot's Dict. 362. Magnalia, i. 435.

§ Felt's Salem, 118, 212, 246, 270.

|| Boucher's Discourses, p. 82.

an unfortunate Episcopal minister but deny, and in respectful terms, the imperial sovereignty of Massachusetts, and though *out of her jurisdiction*, (like the victimized Gorton,) she can summon him to her awful bar of justice, and suffer him to escape, only by promise of voluntary banishment. Such was the lot of the Rev. Richard Gibson, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, as early as 1640! * Thus illustriously did they begin to expound their most sacred vow, not to "deal hardly or oppressingly with any, wherein they were the Lord's stewards"—thus "curiously and efficiently," to dry up those fountains of tears, which they had promised to keep flowing for the Church of England's everlasting welfare—thus to rejoice in her good, and unfeignedly grieve for any sorrow that should ever betide her! If Mr. Gibson had quoted the vow and the letter, which I have now quoted, he might have cost them more time for a reply, than the petitioners of 1646; but, like Morell, he seems to have been a quiet man, and made no resistance, though probably like Blackstone he drew a longer breath at each pace, that removed him from the dominion of the "Lord Brethren."

However, if Gibson was silent under his own wrongs, one of the Eastern Governors was somewhat restive, under the encroachments of the Bay State. He denounces Massachusetts, for reaching too freely and too far, what he calls, in a graphic word, an "engrasping" arm.† It has been seen already, how pervading was "the passion for land,"‡ among those who professed to have a passion for love of liberty and love of conscience, solely and supremely. The imagery of the prophet soon became literally fulfilled, in the notoriously most "engrasping" government in British America. The stretching out of its wings filled the breadth of

* Adams's Portsmouth, p. 27. Farmer's Belknap, i. 29.

† Folsom's Saco, 91.

‡ Bancroft confesses this cost Massachusetts an immense amount of treasure and blood.—United States, iii. 81.

the land. (Isa. viii. 8.) "The great Charter of the Bay Company was unrolled before the General Court in Boston," says Mr. Bancroft, to bring the issue forward full pompously.* And he might have added, (to refer to another prophet,) that "lamentations and mourning and woe," were found written therein, for many who supposed themselves snugly and safely afar. The Charter's wings were found long enough to brood over Maine; and but for Connecticut's suspicions and shyness, (of which Gov. Winthrop distinctly complains,†) might have folded her, too, like a chicken unto its mother's side. Maine did not escape for many a long year. Connecticut did; though, as Dr. Trumbull amply demonstrates, Massachusetts had ever "an itching palm" for her high hills and lovely vallies, and nearly made them her's so late as 1704. Connecticut's *Book of Doom* was once prepared by a Massachusetts governor; but her Day of Judgment, fortunately, Massachusetts never yet has seen.‡

Now, with the treatment of Episcopal clergymen in the person of Richard Gibson, compare Puritanical treatment of an Episcopal Governor, in the person of Edmund Andross; and that, too, amid the solemnities of public worship.§ On such a matter, connected with Andross individually, I would not over-anxiously insist. I have no special sympathies with him, or with his administration; though I could not, even if a sturdy Athanasian, curse them with the vehemence of the Puritanical President, and especially as he does in the name of all New England.|| I but introduce him as an

* Bancroft, i. 430.

† Savage's Wint. i. 284.—Notice the reason why Gorton and his associates were drawn into the vortex of Massachusetts, and why Plymouth and Maine held off.—Savage's Wint. ii. 84, 85; and note 2, to page 85.

‡ Trumbull's Connecticut, i. 411. Hinman's Antiquit. 302, 303.

§ Stiles' Judges, pp. 130, 131.

|| Ibid. p. 111.—Compare Mather's "eternal farewell" of Randolph,

illustration of the feelings of Puritans towards an Episcopalian in authority; for he was the first avowed Episcopal governor in New England. The insult to which I have alluded, was given by *deaconing out*, as the phrase goes, (i. e., the reading a line or two at a time, by a Congregational deacon, for the people to sing after him,) the following verses from the 52d Psalm of Sternhold and Hopkins' version—an incidental proof, by the way, that the Puritans had learned to sing the Psalms of the Church, though they would neither read her Bible, nor pray her Prayers!

1. Why dost thou, tyrant, boast abroad,
   Thy wicked works to praise?
   Dost thou not know there is a God,
   Whose mercies last always?

2. Why doth thy mind yet still devise
   Such wicked wiles to warp?
   Thy tongue untrue, in forging lies,
   Is like a razor sharp.

3. On mischief why set'st thou thy mind,
   And wilt not walk upright?
   Thou hast more lust false tales to find,
   Than bring the truth to light.

4. Thou dost delight in fraud and guile,
   In mischief, blood, and wrong;
   Thy lips have learned the flattering style,
   O false, deceitful tongue!

As to the originality of such abuse, this is but a wretched imitation of the manner in which Charles I. was insulted, by means of the same Psalm, when a prisoner.* As for its

as a "blasted wretch." Remarkables, p. 107. Stout cursing, this. Rome would be put to its trumps to surpass it.

* Lathbury, p. 334.—Long's Review of Baxter's Life, p. 45. The king paid them in their own coin. He called for the Psalm beginning thus,

"Have mercy, Lord, on me, I pray,
For men would me devour."

wit, it might do for a political town-meeting; which many a time and oft has been held in a Puritan house of worship. But thus to rail at him, who, with all his faults as a Churchman and a politician, Douglass declares, "was a good moral man,"*—and that, too, when he was complaisant enough to attend their own services—then to ward off (or try to do so,) his just and expected displeasure with the school-boy fib, that the Psalms were sung in course, (mark: the Jesuitical deacon does not say *that* Psalm was, and even President Stiles cannot defend him)—thus to do, I say, if a specimen of what Puritanical congregations could countenance, is to afford no small proof of the imputation, so often fastened upon them, of copying the Romanist, in making even religion subservient to their private aims and sectarian passions. But why should not even religion have been employed by them, to annoy an unpopular ruler, since it was one of their legitimate maxims—a motto even for the sepulchre—that "rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God."†

This was an admirable text to fight aristocrats with, a century or more ago. It was inspiring truth, when levelled against monarchs, monarchical governors, or Episcopalians. But, unfortunately, just like the veto which the Federalists inserted into our National Constitution, it can be, and it is, turned upon its authors. The demagogue, the mobocrat, the sans-culottes, can claim it, and plead it, as warmly as Dr. Stiles himself, and shout it with even braver lungs. It is no longer true, (sic transit gloria mundi,) as Dr. Morse once said of Connecticut, with such quiet assurance: "The clergy, who are numerous, and, as a body, very respectable, have hitherto preserved a kind of aristocratical balance, in the very democratical government of the State; which has happily operated as a check upon the overbearing spirit of republicanism."‡ But the *aurea æt as* of the Puritan hier-

* Summ. ii. 248.

† Stiles' Judges, p. 107.

‡ Geog. ed. 1792, p. 219.

archy, has long since waned; and deeper sighs have followed its departure, than burst from the lovers of the ancient regime, when the old Charter breathed its last.* Many and many descendants of the liberty-loving and power-resisting Puritans, begin to think that Fisher Ames spoke as prophetically, as he did feelingly, when he said, "It would seem as if it were necessary, that we should endure slavery for some ages, till every drop of democratical blood has been got rid of, by fermentation or bleeding. I dread to look forward to the dismal scenes, through which my children are to pass."†

Yes, it is but too sorry truth, that the posterity of those very men, who proclaimed, and pressed, and fought for the doctrine, that it was meritorious to resist any authority, which *themselves* might interpret as tyrannical, are now shrinking from the precipice to which the "sovereign people" are dragging them, with sneers and scoffs at their hints about "statutes of limitation." Open Agrarianism is now advocated by no feeble pens: witness the pages of Orestes Brownson. And yet, this very man, like Fear in Collins' Ode on the Passions, "scared at the sound himself had made," has recoiled so far, that we now find him in the bosom of "The Holy Roman Church;" where he can believe nothing, on the most sacred of all subjects, but as he is bidden. Nor does this surprise me; for affright at the consequence of *too much liberty* made a Socinian, in my hearing, declare, that the only remedy was what his ancestors denominated *too much power:* in other words, the Divine right of kings. He was a firm Congregationalist, and a man of liberal education, and high taste; and it may well be conceived that I felt somewhat doubtful of my own ears—that like Pharoah, I might awake, and behold, it would be a puzzling dream. But it was a sober reality of open day.

* Snow's Boston, p. 197, 2d edit. † F. Ames's Works, p. 518.

Such are some of the results of intelligent apprehension, when, (to say nothing of discordant elements nearer home,) our American politicians see the interests of the North and South, the East and West, warring with each other, the cords of our Union swaying and cracking under their violence, and dismemberment visibly and audibly threatened. Multitudes think, that our fathers little knew what they were doing, when they took it upon themselves to determine, that that was right, which was right in their own eyes. For the right which they assumed to think for themselves in religion, and to act for themselves in politics, is equally the right of a million, or ten million others; who may be Mormons in faith, and anarchists in practice.* And already, therefore, seeing that this right of boundless private judgment is claimed by the lowest and least intelligent, they begin to dream of Jack Cade and his exemplary myrmidons. Their purse draws back with inward horror, and startles at destruction. Heaven forbid, they cry, that we precipitate ourselves into the gulph of lawlessness—that Mäelstrom of nations! But Heaven stays not for an individual, or an empire, the laws of nature in any department of creation. An acre weary of dependence upon a mountain's side, may not enjoy the liberty of overlaying the plain below, but by becoming ruinous, and entailing ruin on itself. The leveling and revolving system in politics—the system of depressing the rich and elevating the poor—of turning out the skilful and putting in the uninitiated, for the sake of change—of making the clergy, who tell us more religious truth, to say the least, than any body else does—of making them hirelings by the year, or month; and the judge, who speaks the voice of justice, dependent on an annual partisan vote,

* "Civil liberty," said Bishop Butler, the great author of the Analogy, in 1740, "the liberty of a community, is a severe and a restrained thing; implies in the notion of it, authority, settled subordinations, &c."—Works, ii. 327. This was toryism *then;* it would be called conservatism *now*.

may put a state of things in motion, which half our race, gifted with the might of Hercules, the sagacity of Solon, and the perseverance of St. Paul, could neither retard nor guide. There is a torrent of human passion, which, once allowed to overflow, can no more be arrested, than could the sweeping of the tide by the royal Dane. Who by and by there may be to rejoice in the doctrine, that "rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God," or any other doctrine of unbounded liberty and unrestrained resistance, taught by the Puritans of the last and the preceding century, is concealed beneath a dark horizon. But it is no mis-statement, it is no extravagance to say, that many of the brightest sons of Puritan lineage fear, that in less than a half century, the fifty, the forty, the twenty, nay the ten such will not be found—that our soil, fattened with the martyr-blood of 1776, will be furrowed with the thunder of revolution, and our glorious republics have vanished like the cities of the plain, and beneath a storm only not worse than that which buried them in a grave of fire. See how emphatically the statesman Everett warns his countrymen, within the very purlieus of Bunker's memorable mount: "It is not too much to say, that there are, at this moment, noble spirits in the elder world, who are anxiously watching the march of our institutions, to learn whether liberty, as they have been told, is a mockery, a pretence, and a curse; or a blessing, for which it becomes them to brave the rack, the scaffold, and the scimetar." But half a century endows us with the liberty of unchecked freedom, ere language like this must be held, (it was delivered July 4, 1828,) "upon the green turf once wet with precious blood;" not shed to gain triumph for unlimited wills, but, notice the careful limitation, "the sacred cause of *constitutional* liberty."*

And yet, we are told, that deficient or bad as the Puri-

* Everett's Orations, &c. p. 162.

tans might have been, in a hundred other particulars, they merit the highest niche of glory for resistance to tyranny; for untrammelling human opinion and human will, in religion and politics, and allowing each full scope to do its own behests. Must we not still wait, ere we can give this plaudit unqualified acquiescence? After going over such details, as have here been supplied us, might not one suspect them, as the Romanist James II. was suspected, of advocating even freedom of conscience from selfish and sinister motives? *

But I will not dwell upon a strain, which may lay myself open to a suspicion of political preferences and partisanship, which I neither feel nor entertain. I desire not to be called by any name now current among aspirants after office or power; for I dare not profess or esteem myself, a party politician. I trust I love, as truly as many who make louder boasts, my father-land; and yet all its privileges are nothing to me, in comparison to citizenship in the Jerusalem which is above. I would merely be a suggester of the opinion of others, who arrogate far higher political wisdom than I shall ever pretend to, that the community which propounds and defends the doctrine, that self-willed freedom, in *one way*, is lawfully to be striven for, nay, fought for, may encourage its successors, as the world is going on in development unto perfection, to heighten and widen the doctrine, by discovering some new way of being freer, until the end is emancipation from all law, and prostration of the distinctions of the social state. Something like this, Mr. Dana the poet, the philosopher, and in theology, I suppose, a Puritan, predicted and portrayed, years now gone by.† And following after him, *haud passibus æquis*, my wish is to show, that many of our own times, and while breathing a New England atmosphere, are this moment retreating from that self-enlarging liberty,

* Boucher's Disc. p. 60.

† On "Law as suited to Man."—Bib. Repos. and Quart. Observer No. xvii. January, 1835.

which, however manageable with sugar of lead for posset, and iron stays for a girdle, in the days when Calvinism was fundamental law, has at last grown so fat and saucy as to kick like Jeshurun. (Deut. xxxii. 15.)

LETTER XII.

The discursive plan pursued in the last letter must be followed still. I shall continue stating matters, without particular reference to time or order; some of which, perhaps, have no direct historical connexion with Episcopalians, but all of which go to illustrate the system, that condemns them and upbraided their forefathers, and all of which, therefore, an Episcopalian may fairly bring forward in self-defence, to teach his assailants to be quiet and look at home. It may be important for me to state afresh, (to keep the idea alive,) that these letters are by no means undertaken as an act of aggression, or with an aggressive spirit. But when there is no other way of diverting an adversary, who has kept talking on steadily, for two centuries, about Episcopal tyranny, corruption, and cruelty, it may, at last, possibly, be admitted as right to try to open his eyes upon some unread passages in his own annals, that ought to make him a trifle more considerate of his neighbors. I see a late writer, in one of our journals, complaining that Episcopacy is still systematically insulted, in orations, songs, and toasts, poured forth over Puritan reminiscences. There seems to be no other mode left to teach some to look away from *our* magnified faults, but by calling the public to look at *their* forgotten ones. If this be not lawful, then it would hardly

be legitimate to say, "He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone."

In my tenth Letter, the petition of Roger Price and others was referred to, to show how Episcopalians were, at so late a period as 1731, treated with less lenity than Anabaptists and Quakers.* One of the chief complaints of Mr. Price and his associates was, that Episcopalians were not allowed the common privileges of the elective franchise. In the Danforth papers,† the King's Commissioners are found complaining, that the Puritans raised the qualification for the elective franchise, to a price which "not one English member in a hundred" paid. ‡ In fact, it is affirmed by Justice Story, as already quoted, that so late as 1676, (eleven years after the King's remonstrance through his officers!) "five sixths of the Colony were disfranchised by the influence of the ecclesiastical power." My readers should carefully mark the expression, "the ecclesiastical power;" for the eminently astute jurist, who commented on the case, perfectly understood the source of the enormous evil, and accurately assigns it. And with so high an authority as a preface, perhaps I may as well here, as any where, make a few remarks, as my subject requires me to do somewhere, upon the influence of the PURITAN MINISTERS.

We hear much about the priestcraft of Popery, and of its "abomination of desolation." In relation to Episcopacy, the Puritans did not hesitate to aver, that "it is come to an ordinary proverb, that when any thing is spoiled we use to say, 'The bishop's foot hath been in it;'" and that the

* In 1722, the Governor of Massachusetts ordered the Puritans of Newburyport not to tax Churchmen.—Caleb Cushing's Newburyport, p. 45. Still, here in 1731, they were crying for relief as loud as ever.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, viii. 76.

‡ Yet the story is, the English laws were severer than Puritan ones. —Kingsley's Disc. p. 49.

Episcopal office was but "a stirrup for Antichrist to get into the saddle."* But was there never such a thing as priestcraft, in the palmy days of New England history? did not the pastoral office of the Puritanical parsons serve as a stirrup for a virtual Inquisition to mount the saddle, and, like Death on the pale horse, to ride over the land scattering infernal terrors? Let us see.

The Puritanical ministers of New England tampered with the affairs of State, as incessantly and perseveringly, as the most meddling Jesuits; and, until a late day, always influentially.† Even Endicott and others, though knighted by the chivalrous President Stiles for their "hearts of oak," had their ghostly oracles, who made them pliant as willow wands; disciplined and moulded them with the illimitable power of father confessors. Did there happen to occur a juncture, or a difficulty, of more than ordinary pressure—"the elders did not fail to attend in the gloomy season."‡ The elders presumed to interpret "the mind of God."§ Some have supposed that the Puritans and the Dutch were, or, (for gratitude's sake,) ought to be "chief friends." Nevertheless, the elders imputed to the Dutch an "execrable plot, tending to the destruction of the dear saints of God." "In the name of many pensive hearts," these same ministers of the Prince of Peace could solicit the Government to overwhelm these same "chief friends," with all the horrors of war.|| And under such powerful sacerdotal rhetoric no doubt it was, that even Massachusetts, at first scrupulous about a war, because most of the money to sustain it must have come from her own pocket, at length yielded, and devoted the poor Dutch to absolute extirpation.¶ But why should not all this be, or even more? For the

* Smectymnuus, pp. 30, 77, 78.—For some account of this book, see Gen. Biog. Dict. of Bernard, &c. iv. 24, notes.

† Story's Misc. p. 64. ‡ Bancroft, i. 440.

§ Hutch. Hist. i. 167. || Ibid. 167, 168. ¶ Ibid. i. 170.

elders, according to a pithy little note of Hutchinson, "turned the scale" of civil government "from the beginning," until a number of years after the issue of the commission of King Charles II. Nothing but a royal governor could counterpoise their habitual "balance."* And even a royal governor had to propitiate their potential favor "in civil things," had to unfold "with all plainness the reasons of" his "procedure, and that they may be satisfactory" to those, who were the unprescribed keepers of *his* conscience, with powers not inferior to the Lord Chancellor, who keeps the royal conscience, under the solemnities of legal responsibility. And, moreover, when the period arrived that their direct sway became feebler or intermittent, they were still slow to abdicate *vested rights*, and presumed to advise, admonish, or denounce, the representative of kingly majesty. Especially, if he dared to forget due court to those who sat in "Moses' seat," he might be stoutly rebuked in the style pontifical; and if he heeded not the decretals of sacerdotal self-sufficiency, he might be branded as a WRETCH, in a private journal, intended as a record of the free effusions of a pure and peaceful heart.†

Nor was it a governor only, whom the elders could benefit with their patronizing counsel; like Cardinal Protectors of the different courts of Europe at the ecclesiastical centre—Rome.‡ Legislatures, also, were entitled to its eleemosynary honors.§ And when a diplomatic document, and, by easy parity of reasoning, any other important public document, did not please the elders, or touched the purity of their (lawn I suppose I must not say, but silk probably might be admissible; for silks were no such strange

* Hutch. Hist. i. 303.—Compare Upham on the King, in his Life of Vane, p. 152. Bancroft on the Ministers.—United States, iii. 74.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, iii. 137, 138.

‡ See History of Cardinals, translated. London, 1670, p. 105.

§ Hutch. Collect. p. 436.

things in Puritan times—as we shall see—nor gowns and bands either,) silk, it could be expunged by as formidable lines, as once blackened a Resolution of our National Senate.* The elders were authorized to pronounce "treason against the civil government, treason against Christ."† So superior were they in wisdom to the laity, less largely endued, (Cotton's ordination being witness,) "as by a sign from God," that they could revise juridical and other decisions, and give them the "tower stamp" of their infallible imprimatur.‡ They so faithfully copied the model, which Justice Story says they virtually re-enacted, i. e., the Inquisition, that they could imitate one of its favorite practices at an *Auto da Fe.* They could compel sentenced convicts, as it were *in articulo mortis*, to listen to wholesome homilies upon that authority, which doomed them for heresy or contumacy.§ "Nor," says Mr. Bancroft, at a moment when their "mists" of persecution became so thick that even *he* could not pierce through them, "Nor can it be denied, nor should it be concealed, that the elders, especially Wilson and Norton, instigated and sustained the Government in its worst cruelties."|| So that he subjoins, in another such moment, a triumphant vindication of a name, calumniated by Puritans more than all the victims of their defamation put together. "LAUD," says this devoted apologist of Puritanical history, when its inconsistencies temporarily overpowered him, "LAUD WAS JUSTIFIED BY THE MEN WHOM HE HAD WRONGED."¶

* Savage's Wint. i. 286. † Bancroft, i. 450.

‡ Ibid. i. 440.—They must be consulted, ere a body of laws can be made. Hubbard, 157. And Benedict says, they could induce magistrates to *resist* a king's mandamus, when it required ecclesiastical charity. —Benedict's Baptists, i. 400.

§ Savage's Wint. ii. 142, 238, notes.

|| For example, they petitioned the legislature to pass an act to banish Quakers on pain of death.—Gough's Quakers, i. 371.

¶ Bancroft, i. 447, 451.

Yes, most truly, Laud, with crosier and mitre, was never more puissant, than a Puritan ministry under the "ceremoniall accoutrements" of Genevan orthodoxy. The Puritan pulpit, and not the forum, was the arena for legislation: the pulpit, and not the court, the bed of justice. And Hubbard, whom I have before quoted, but must re-quote, in trying to eulogize his brethren, Hooker and Cotton, lets this unsavory fact leak out. They were "Two such eminent stars," "both of the first magnitude, though of differing influence," that they "could not well continue in one and the same orb." This is a very grandiloquent way of translating the old proverb, about disagreement between those of the same trade. Hooker would not be outshone by Cotton, and so he went to Hartford, Connecticut;* and then verified the praise, as Hubbard thought it, of Cotton at Boston, (though in England it would have been Laudean, and in France or Spain, Jesuitical,) of having "whatever he delivered in the pulpit," "soon put into an order of court, if of a civil, or set up as a practice in the church, if of an ecclesiastical concernment."†

This same pulpit, too, under the auspices of such men as Cotton of Boston, Hooker of Hartford, and Davenport of New Haven, (Puritan *Dii majorum gentium*,)‡ extended its tutelage far and wide. "Shadowing with wings," it could take the ceremonies of social life under its cognizance, and with the pluripresent supervision and unpaid

* The Presbyterian Dr. Robertson agrees with me in this. (See America, book x.) It cannot but amuse an impartial observer, to see how soon the spirit of Diotrephes exhibited itself among the vociferous proclaimers of ministerial parity! "Diotrephenism," as Mr. Hart called it in his critique on Noah Hobart, found many a snug nook and corner in a land which abhorred dioceses.

† Hubbard, pp. 173, 182.

‡ Or, as Cotton Mather calls them, olive-trees which afford a singuar measure of oil.—Magnalia, i. 243.

kindness of the "Holy Office," became a director even of *the ton.* The pulpit preached on, or it preached off, wigs and veils[94]—raised its tonsorial voice, and away flew curls and queues, like the thistle-down before the whirlwind; and craniums were as round and smooth as that time-honored vegetable, which has graced and gladdened ten thousand thousand thanksgiving dinners. "The use of tobacco," in Puritanism's days of *purity*, "was prohibited," says Dr. Morse, "under a penalty,* and the smoke of it, in some manuscripts, is compared to the smoke of the bottomless pit." But mark what he says becomes of it, when the occupants of Puritan pulpits unfortunately got an inkling of the vile weed, and to their astonishment found in it creature-comfort. "At length," he adds, "some of the clergy fell into the practice of smoking, and tobacco by an act of government was set at liberty."† As if the occupants of such a throne could do more than a Pope ever pretended to, in the days of a Hildebrand, turn the smoke of the bottomless pit into a sweet-smelling savor! But the pulpit could do more than make tobacco orthodox. It became a mint altogether matchless for the current coin of superstition. It condensed airy witch-craft into a tangible reality, and decreed an Indian war to be Heaven's special judgment upon wigs and scratches.[95] ‡ Let those remember this, who can talk so clamorously about Ap. Laud's superstitious conversion of trifling incidents into solemn providences—a common complaint against his diary; though not more justly complained of in him, than in almost every body in that peculiar age. And if that is not sufficient, let them remember that when

[94] See Note 94. [95] See Note 95.

* A man might smoke in his own house, provided he was *alone!* If he smoked before even an acquaintance, he was fined.—Felt's Ipswich, p. 41.

† Geog. p. 187. ‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, viii. 27.

a snake crawled into the famous synod of 1648, in the heat of its ecclesiastical legislation, it was supposed the very devil had insinuated himself there: an instance of theological conjecture, in which some perhaps will not accuse them of the Athenian error of being "too superstitious."*

Well therefore does Mr. Bancroft write, illustrating Puritan inconsistency as well as his own, (for I should suppose him sarcastic if I did not know his strong bias,) "The colonists of Massachusetts had emigrated for the enjoyment of purity of religion: and while they scrupulously refused to the clergy even the least shadow of political power, they deliberately entrusted the whole government to those of the laity, over whose minds the ministers would probably exert *an unvarying influence.*"† "Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine" —the Church dreads the sight of blood—said the Jesuit of *his* Church, when she employed the hands of others to accomplish her sanguinary designs. The Puritan and his champions may, with equally felicitous logic, exculpate the New England elders from the unlawful exercise of civil or political power. They only *advised*, as the late Dr. Worcester of Salem, Mass., tells us was done by the great Ecumenical Council, in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles—an assembly which he, in one of his sermons, would fain convert into such a council of imbecility, as Congregationalists are in the habit of summoning at the present day. But, too often, this meek and gentle *advice*

* Savage's Winthrop, ii. 330.

† Bancroft, i. 391.—This is from Bancroft's *first* edition of his United States. I am sorry to be obliged again to notice his disingenuousness; but the instance is too glaring to be passed by. For *all* which I have now quoted, the *seventh* edition gives us this: "The Calvinists of Massachusetts, scrupulously refusing to the clergy the least shadow of political power, established the reign of the visible church—a commonwealth of the chosen people in covenant with God."—Seventh edit. vol. i. p. 361. It is useless to comment on an historian who will thus belie himself; he is his own best refutation.

claimed all the dignity and sway of that Council's synodical letter, and, with a proud humility, became all which its letter both was and professed to be, (Dr. W. did not read far enough,) "*decrees for to keep.*" (Acts xvi. 4.)

Oh, most mournfully true was it, that a generation which had called prelacy a stirrup for Antichrist to get into the saddle, were ridden by the bit and bridle of an anti-prelatic priesthood, who, if "mocked" by insubordination, as Balaam supposed himself "mocked," could more than wish a sword into their hands to avenge their depreciated honors. Nevertheless, says Mr. Bacon, balking not at a camel, when he had strained out many a gnat: "I hesitate not to say, that no instance can be found in the history of man, in which the ministers of religion, as a body, have so completely and spontaneously denuded themselves of all power, civil and ecclesiastical, as was done by the ministers of New England."* Denuded themselves of all power, civil and ecclesiastical? Ah, what a sweet romantic dream, if it could have been indulged by such as Gorton, or Vassall, the petitioners of 1646, or even those of 1731; to say nothing of Quakers, *et id omne genus!* Nay, not less sweet if it could have been indulged in by many of their very selves, not gifted, Wilson-wise or Cotton-wise, as by a sign from God! But it might not be. The sturdy son of freedom, who would not bow the head at the Name of Jesus, nor bend the knee before the pledges of his love, had to bow, and bend, and surrender, (like the votary of a Romish monastic order to his Superior,) to a priest created by his spiritual ballot-box.

This may seem contradictory, but is easily explained. The Puritans were deliberately taught, that the magistracy and the ministry had powers *jure divino*, which the people could neither give nor take away. The people had nothing

* Address, p. 34.

to do with either, but to put men into places where they would exercise powers, accorded to them by Heaven Supreme. That was the true doctrine—that was the undiluted orthodoxy, of the days of the golden age. The modern doctrine, that the people were the source of power, was utterly discountenanced. The people could give *place* only. *Power* came from God alone; and to God alone were its possessors responsible for the exercise of its prerogatives.*

Higher church doctrine than this, better passive-obedience and non-resistance doctrine than this, there could not well be; for it is the doctrine of the Pope's own self. The Pope obtains his *place* by election: he is not born to it, nor does it come to him by any routine or prescription. But the *powers* of his place are underived from man, and he exercises them as the vicegerent of the Almighty. Just such a pope, (only he was a petty one,) did the Puritanical minister conceive himself; and well, therefore, like Cotton, might he presume himself qualified to announce universal law.

No wonder that under such tuition, even an outward secular distinction should be decreed superstitious, and an attempt be made to have saints militant feel that the pulpit ("drum ecclesiastic") was to give the pitch and tone to their rough trade. It is an absolute fact, that Endicott, (who was always thorough enough, after the visit of the Brownistical doctor from Plymouth, and a repeated experience of his spiritual boluses,)† attacked the banner of his country, and caused the cross to be torn out of it as a symbol of idolatry! True, an attempt has been made to show,

* Belknap's Biog. ii. 353, 354. Simple Cobbler, new edit. pp. 54, 55. Pemberton's Sermons, 1727, pp. 149, 263.—Pemberton held also the awful high-church doctrine, that *ordination* conferred the ministerial powers.—Sermons, p. 264, etc.

† Gordon's American War, i. 20.

that this act was disapproved of.* But the issue speaks rather for the triumph of clerical insinuations. That cross was never restored, though Endicott was nominally rebuked, by being dropped from office for a little while. When the slight cast upon the king's colors was complained of by the officer of a British ship, the Puritans tried to evade the difficulty, by saying that there were no king's colors "in the whole colony." They had, doubtless, been plenty enough just previously; and this evasion indirectly shows how thoroughly superstition had done its work, by mutilating every royal ensign within reach. The pitiful evasion, however, did not save them: they were offered the proper colors from a British vessel. And now, driven to the last nook of ingenuity, how did they escape? Why they said the proper standard might float at the fort, as that "belonged to the King;" but on shore, they could not allow it because its idolatrous character was indelible.† And thus Endicott, with the ministers, was sustained at last, and triumphed gloriously. And, what is very remarkable, their hatred of the cross was so effectually transmitted to posterity, that, on the showing of Mr. Upham, (who gives a somewhat amusing account of the whole affair in his life of Harry Vane,) there was not a British ensign seen in Salem, where it was first dishonored, till 1834, and that was borrowed! ‡

Be all this, however, as insignificant as those will think, who remember not how straws mark the currents of a mighty atmosphere, there is something in Endicott's history which shows, incontestably, how his systematic self-will and tyranny, with those of the virtual prelates who spurred him on, were really agreeable to the people—that they made no

* Hubbard, 164, 165.

† According to Mr. Felt, they were even more "cute" than this. On the banner of the fort they put the king's arms, instead of the cross.—Felt's Salem, p. 95.

‡ Sparks' Amer. Biog. first series, iv. 111, 115.

long objection to the *powers* of him, or his advisers, i. e. his father confessors. And this is the notorious fact, they gave him the *place* wherein to exercise his *powers* with fullest scope—the place of Governor. And more, they made him Governor, while office was disposable by election, (the Charter of 1691 made the Governor an officer of the Crown,) longer than any other person. He was removed from his station at the advanced age of seventy-five, and then only by death !*

This fact (a most marked and meaning one) suggested itself to me, and was actually recorded, *before* I read in the angry criticism of a commentator on my former papers, that Winthrop " was *eleven times* chosen Governor of the Colony; the best of all proofs that his Puritan brethren were pleased with his spirit and sentiments." I was about to draw a similar inference, from better premises, in relation to Endicott, the tool of clerical superstition, and the greedy imbiber of peppery orthodoxy. My critic threw himself in my way, at an unfortunate juncture, and ventured, without knowing his hazard, to supply me with "the best of all proofs" that my inference was a right one. It was with some commiseration that I turned his own weapon against his own breast; but truth required it, and the smart, doubtless taught him future caution, for I never heard from him again, unless in the shape of an abusive allegation which required no answer.

The mistake, too, about Winthrop's term of office was not the only one made by my heedless censor. He was equally mistaken about the disinterested partiality of the Puritans in his behalf. Winthrop was indeed a matchless Governor for them in one way; of all others the chariest in

* Savage's Winthrop, i. 26, note. Compare Eliot's Dict. p. 195. And Oldmixon's Brit. Emp. in America, on Endicott and Bellingham, i. 107. He was a bitter whig; and yet he says they were both as bad as Archbishop Laud.

their consideration. He was rich. He could serve *without pay*, and would receive *no presents*.* But, says Belknap, "before he left England" he "was of a more catholic spirit than some of his brethren."† He was the foremost signer of that celebrated letter, which "has occasioned a dispute, whether the first settlers of Massachusetts were of the Church of England or not."‡ He was suspected of a design, of at least a desire, to have his office a perpetuity, like a bishopric or a monarchy.§[96] Therefore, as New Englanders sometimes say, he was *ousted;* and once with most scanty ceremony.||

But, to pursue the train of thought respecting one, whom the Elders loved much better; for they had opposed Winthrop's aspirations after perpetual office, because there was (then fearfully) too much of English leaven left in him. The governor for whom Puritan smiles were less capricious, the sanguinary and tyrannizing Endicott, (a man who had the requisite "Christian apathy on soft affections,"¶) is said by Dr. Bentley, in his history of Salem, to have lost the confidence of his friends beyond the seas. He was rebuked by even the urbane and pacific philosopher, Robert Boyle.** And it is a notorious fact, that the King himself, through a letter of Secretary Morice, *requested* (not commanded) his removal from office. It is true Endicott died before the influence of this letter could be felt; yet, says Judge Davis,

[96] See Note 96.

---

* Prince's Annals, Pt. 2, p. 60. In Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, vii.—Yet they could dispute his accounts for public expenditures. Hutchinson's Hist. i. 43.

† Biog. ii. 356.

‡ Hutch. Hist. i. 24.

§ Savage's Wint. i. 299.

|| Quincy's Address, pp. 33, 34.

¶ Such was a part of Cotton's praise. See his epitaph. Davis's Morton, p. 253.

** Savage's Wint. i. 56, note. Bancroft, i. 344, note. Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, vi. 245; 2d series, viii. 50, 51.

"there can be no doubt the royal intimation to his prejudice would have been ALTOGETHER DISREGARDED."*

Thus it may be perceived, that he is steadily chosen governor, through thick and thin, and would have continued to be chosen so, with perhaps brusker pertinacity, if his enjoyment of office could give uneasiness to a monarch's cogitations. "Neither Endicott † nor Dudley," says a high authority, "possessed what in the present age would be called liberality of sentiment or urbanity of manners."‡ Therefore they were the fittest instruments for Puritans, wherewith to ruffle the down of royalty. No people indeed could be humbler than they, in soliciting royal charters. They could then look up to a throne with awe-struck eyes, and say, "Most gracious and dread sovereign:" this was their favorite beginning, when they had a boon to ask themselves. And their favorite ending was, a craving to be enrolled among his "Majesty's most humble subjects and suppliants." And still none could take a more peculiar satisfaction, than they seemed to do, in using a Charter, when once obtained, for the discomfort and annoyance of its royal giver, and any cordially devoted to that giver, either in religion, diplomacy, or politics. Such was their tact at evasion, (as the story about the cross torn from the royal colors may illustrate,) such their art in interpretation and persistance, or, as they expressed it, in "avoiding and protracting,"§ that a monarch appeared, as a matter of course, to grant a charter at special hazard to his own interests; to create a party, *ex officio* hostile to his administration; to establish a petty sovereignty, which would compete for dominion with the throne he sat upon. The recipients of this charter

* Davis's Morton, p. 317, note.

† Hutchinson speaks slightingly of Endicott's "mental accomplishments."—Hutch. Hist. i. 22, note.

‡ Eliot's Dict. p. 156.

§ Quincy's Address, p. 37.

might transcend its powers; but their "magic daring"* was nothing but manly independence and sacred love of liberty. A king's conscience was with them a matter no doubt, for mirth and laughter; but let a king's commissioner touch their own in the minutest article, (that for instance of keeping Saturday night as holy time,) and the grating doors of a prison are agape for him.† And in this way they could prove their readiness to vindicate the Majesty of Heaven, by making another's conscience submissive to their own. They could also steadily and provokingly refuse a small request of him, upon whose smiles a misused charter depended for its very life, and their readiness at disobliging would only be a noble Roman firmness. But let the giver of Charters think for one instant of circumscribing privileges, which he believed to be abused—let him remonstrate even with those to whom a charter is conceded as a warrant for mercy to the heathen, because under it they notwithstanding persecute their own kindred in name and blood, and even so summer-like a temper as Mr. Greenwood's grows frosty, and he talks about "arrogant styles" and "profligate tyrants."

Winthrop, whom the elders feared as a fixture, and whom the people turned out of office because he could not learn Puritanical lessons as fast as Endicott, was governor, at one time with another, *eleven years*. And this proves, we are told, what mild, moderate, clemency-loving people they were, who endowed him with gubernatorial honors. Oh, that the logic were not built, like the house of the unwise man, upon the sand! Winthrop possessed fortune, and he could, and having a generous disposition he did, give rather than receive. It was no loss, nor a very severe vex-

* Quincy's Address, p. 24.

† And this was self-defence! See Quincy's Address, p. 28. Then the Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber were but the self-defensive tribunals of England.

ation, to see the salary which would have been paid his Excellency, accumulating in the public coffers, against a rainy day. It was not one of the most discomposing reflections, that the people's pockets would be disturbed the less, because he loved the more to keep them full. The Puritans could feelingly subscribe to the profession of the ancient inhabitants of Delphi. "No man, however, can recollect that ever we put it to the vote, whether we would accept a donation or not; or that ever any one would have hindered a person from offering and presenting to us what he pleased."* Yet a time arrived, when even such considerations were not effective. There is one thing which men delight in, even beyond self-interest, and that is self-will. There may be junctures, when even that interest can be overlooked for the gratification of this will. Winthrop was one of the best governors, which Puritanism, it can hardly be said solicited, but with tolerable grace endured.† But his composition (peace to his memory!) was dashed with some drops of mercy, a few too many. He could pity Roger Williams,‡ and give him kind advice in secret, though in public obliged to frown upon his love of toleration.§ He would be courteous to La Tour and his unfortunate fellow Papists, whom distress constrained to seek shelter in Boston Bay. Suspicion fastens upon him her leaden eye. The timid, and yet unroughened temper of the amiable gentleman re-

* Tooke's Lucian, ii. 679, 680.

† Even Mr. Neal rouses up against his scurvy treatment. "The peevish and froward people could hardly give him a good word, but were ready, on every occasion, to censure him as the author of all the calamities that befel them."—New England, i. 276.

‡ Poor Capt. Partridge, also, who came near being their victim for heresies, uttered *out of their jurisdiction.* He had spoken freely in his own ship, on the deep; and for that he must render an account to pontifical Massachusetts. He professed to be a Puritan too.—Savage's Wint. ii. 251.

§ Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, i. 276.

treats before it. His pliancy is remembered, rather for his injury. By and by, however, adapting himself somewhat to his circumstances, he grows bolder. Now he begins to exercise his forecast upon that freedom of individual wills, which knows no law, and will acknowledge no restraint. With him, it became at length no solecism, that even liberty itself may be too free: a sentiment which once would have been laughed to scorn by Puritan politicians, but which many of their descendants now avow with pale countenances and foreboding hearts. Indeed, this sentiment of Winthrop's is now rather common than infrequent on Puritan soil; from which many an eye is looking abroad upon the sea of agitations which surrounds it, and expecting ever and anon to see the fountains of the great deep of anarchy and misrule burst their bounds, and deluge the world with woe. He dreamed, perhaps, of such a catastrophe, two hundred years ago, or caught an echo of its coming across the ocean; for the days of the Commonwealth were nigh. "There is," said he, "a liberty of corrupt nature, which is inconsistent with authority, impatient of restraint, the enemy of truth and peace, and all the ordinances of God are bent against it. But there is a civil, moral, federal liberty, which consists in every one's enjoying his property, and having the benefit of the laws of his country, a liberty for that only which is just and good; for this liberty you are to stand with your lives." *

And for a temper which cherished such doctrine, what was his great reward? That of many who at this day, the moment they hint, though in allusions the most distant, that there may be abuses of complete political independence, and talk not of *all* freedom, but, like Mr. Everett, of "constitutional liberty," are forthwith branded as aristocrats: not even the most undoubted Puritan lineage prov-

* Allen's Biog. Dict. p 784.

ing a democratic salvation. Winthrop was once suspected of aspiring to something like a sceptre,* and had to lay down the wand of office with summary expedition. Afterterward, it is true, it was restored to him; but not, says Mr. Quincy, till he and his successors and fellow-thinkers had received "a succession of lessons, for which they were probably the wiser the rest of their lives."†

But Endicott, (that "deep enthusiast" as Dr. Robertson called him, and whose conduct Graham stigmatizes as "riotous and violent,"‡) either knew better how to manage the Puritans; or, which is far more probable, heartily coincided with them. He was unquestionably much the inferior of Winthrop, in all respects, unless it were brute courage; but he was, as unquestionably, in the intensest meaning of the terms, *a people's man.* And the people's reciprocation of idolatry was richly manifested, in his life-long enjoyment of their highest office, and in frequent substantial remembrancers, in the shape of "entire property in soil."[97] He well understood, and faithfully upheld, those principles which the people most devoutly cherished. "Principles of aggrandizement," says Mr. George Chalmers, (one who, by his researches in the Plantation Office,§ was enabled to form opinions on that evidence, which Mr. Bancroft and others would appropriate to themselves, viz. *documentary testimony*,) "Principles of aggrandizement seem constantly to have been had in view by Massachusetts, as the only rule of its conduct."§ His dream for posterity was like the oracle of old,

> Omnia, sub pedibus, qua Sol utrumque recurrens
> Aspicit Oceanum, vertique regique videbunt.¶

[97] See Note 97.

---

* Quincy's Address, p. 33. Also Savage's Winthrop, i. 86.

† Quincy's Address, p. 34. ‡ North America, i. 269.

§ Pref. to his Annals, pp. iii. and iv. ‖ Ibid. p. 180.

¶ Æneid, vii. 100.

Taking such principles and such a dream, as his guides, and their object, for his watchword, Endicott pressed towards the prize of his sect, with a steadiness like that of the magnet for its pole. It was less his private life, than his signal devotion to the grand scheme of preserving and transmitting a national religion, which made "the Patriarch David" a man after God's own heart. And, in strict keeping with this true and just interpretation of that proverbbial phrase, (which is otherwise a hook for sceptics to hang doubts on,) Endicott was a man after the inmost heart, of the "engrasping," self-aggrandizing spirits of his age and clime. Oh, he was indeed too appositely fitted to be such. His bigotry seemed to be all over gnarled and knotted; so that if he had had poetical justice inflicted on him, by such a censor as Dante, he might have been converted into one of those frightful crab-trees, where he supposes some souls imprisoned, and whose branches were roosts for harpies.* His temper was of that porcupine description, which Pope Ganganelli, in the expressive letters ascribed to him, has likened to a chestnut-burr. He was thorny on all sides. His lighter touch was dangerous; and even his fist, as one Dexter discovered to his sorrow, could be as lively as that of an athlete with his iron glove.†—With such pre-eminent qualifications for persecution, he conjoined an eager and always foreseeing eye.‡ This he had fixed perpetually upon the *end* of his vocation; and seizing that in will and hope, when he could do no more, he was so absorbed in the raptures of anticipation, that, like a thorough Jesuit, he was *honestly* uncareful about the *means* which would realize his longings.

Did *Churchmen* cross his path? Their property melted

* Carey's Dante, i. 67. Compare Smith's letter to him, quoted by Gough.—Gough's Quakers, ii. 46.

† Lewis's Hist. of Lynn, p. 39.—He was a "stout gentleman." Sav. Wint. ii. 56.

‡ Davis's Morton, p. 317, note.

away like snow-wreaths, and for themselves no safety could be found, but on the soil of Britain, which then, in the fables of the Puritans, brought forth armed oppressors, as if, after fables older still, it had been sown with the teeth of dragons.—Did *Anabaptists* venture to interrupt his darling schemes for Puritanic sovereignty and consolidation, with the portentous hint, that the bodies of his fellow-men, if not their souls, needed fuller ablutions than they had yet experienced? He cowes and silences them with legislative thunders, no faint re-echoes from the Vatican. And if he had not the wire-whips and whips with spur-rowels, that the Spanish Armada was bringing in such goodly store for rebellious England,* he had ample supply of three-corded scourges for them;† or, for want of such a handy article, could doubtless try a musket-barrel, after the practice upon Oldham's back at Plymouth.—Did form-abhorring *Quakers*, (*i. e.* in appearance such: in reality, few or none have more forms—making even grammar an article of faith:) did they open their pestiferous lips about the civil government, or church polity, of a soil exclusively *not* theirs? a government and polity which long were "solemn sisters" on these shores of liberty—a government and polity it was his soul's delight to rear, mature, enlarge, and fortify—for such "pernicious vagabonds" he could make the State, like a laboring volcano, throw out torrents of lava to sweep them to destruction. Such he could put in cages, bury in dungeons, or grind with fines. Such he could strip almost to nudity, chain to a cart's tail like dancing bears, and mangle with a scourge from town to town, if there were fifty in succession.‡

* Phenix Britannicus, p. 451.

† See Benedict's Baptists, i. 374, 379. Bliss's Rehoboth and Seekonk, pp. 206, 207.

‡ The law of mercy, it will be recollected, passed after King Charles's remonstrance, provided that the Quakers should be whipped through but *three* towns!!!

Through the unruly members of such seditious speechifiers, he could bore with a red-hot iron;[98] and when torture, short of death, could not tire their radicalism down, he could stretch them on the scaffold, and leave their "cursed" carcasses for the beasts of the field and the birds of heaven.* This he could do, unblenchingly, while no relentings left an impress on his well-cased heart: a heart which President Stiles pronounced "of oak," but which an exacter judgment might have declared to be *lignum vitæ.*† Or, to abandon my own language, which some will think too like the subject it describes, and to adopt, as an interlude, the classics of the Magnalia over a corresponding hero:

> The Quaker, trembling at his thunder, fled,
> And with Caligula resumed his bed.
> He, by the motions of a nobler spirit,
> Clear'd men, and made their notions swine inherit.
> The Munster goblin, by his holy flood
> Exorcised, like a thin phantasma stood.
> Brown's Babel, shatter'd by his lightning, fell,
> And with confused horror pack'd to hell.‡

What, finally, he could and did do, to Antinomians and Familists, Reevesites and Muggletonians, Gortonists and the Aborigines, and shoals of unwritten heresies—what to all who durst presume to trench, anywise closely, on the soil or rights of his imperial colony, I need not say. Imagination, with the aids already given, can easily complete the picture. What would have been the issue, had the mother-country been so embroiled in civil war as to be unable to inspect her distant settlements—what if Cromwell had longer reigned—what if Endicott's life had been in its spring

[98] See Note 98.

---

* This will be proved when we come to the letter relating particularly to the Quakers.

† Even Neal says he was "too severe." New England, ii. 346.

‡ Magnalia, ii. 95.

and not its autumn—it is hardly possible to fancy. But most certain it is, that during the last years of his undesirable existence, the lurid clouds of a reign of terror seemed to be fast spreading over these western skies, and preparing to pour a storm of "hail-stones and coals of fire." True, says Mr. Bancroft, with most inglorious complacency, but *four* Quakers were absolutely executed.* Yes, Heaven be thanked for its interventions, there were actually no more. But how many, of whom the prisons were emptied when the royal *mandamus* arrested blood-shedding, would have followed their fatal steps, and been wrapped in their awful shroud, had the old state of things continued—Heaven only knows.[99] Charles was restored—Endicott died; and when the sun seemed to be turning into darkness, and the moon into blood, the day of deliverance dawned in the East, and the day-star of hope arose in many a fear-worn heart.

Let the persecutor sleep as he can in his gloomy grave. Better, oh far better, were it, to languish in prison man's whole limit of life, or to die two deaths like Laud's under the executioner's axe, than to grow hoary in intolerance, and spend our shortening breath in a cause, which, under the impressive testimony of Justice Story, had the substance of the Inquisition if not its forms, "with a full share of its terrors and its violence." Si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse adspici laniatus et ictus; quando, ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitiâ, libidine, malis consultis, animus dilaceretur.‡

[99] See Note 99.

---

* Whitelock, the Lord Keeper of Cromwell, says that the severest of Queen Elizabeth's laws about conformity was never executed but *once* or *twice*. Will that excuse Churchmen?—Whitelock's Essays, p. 119.

† Story's Misc. p. 66. ‡ Tacit. Ann. lib. vi. 6.

LETTER XIII.

My last letter was chiefly occupied with some remarks upon the spirit and conduct of the Puritanical priesthood, and the characters and administrations of two of the best-known governors of the foremost of Puritan commonwealths—that of Massachusetts. They were given, and may be used, I conceive, as a fair offset against the hackneyed censures of Puritan essayists, orators, and lyric-mongers, upon the Episcopal Church and government of our mother country. And, now, if Puritans will only praise others than themselves, their literary productions will have an element hitherto estranged from them, and a new era begin. But if not, and if Churchmen still hear Ap. Laud's character vilified, (as I believe has been done again and again in a Lyceum lecture, where courtesy should enforce restraint on topics of controversy,) I have helped them to a name, which might answer for a foil to philippics, as stormy as the orations against Cataline.

Few works of compilation would be easier, than to expand these letters, by rambling at large over the diversified field of Massachusetts ecclesiastical history, and to show how ill, in the minutest matters, Puritans ever bore their faculties towards Churchmen. Some, however, will think I have said too much already. Of them I beg a little patience; for I am not yet prepared to leave untold several things concerning the treatment which Episcopalians received at the hands of brethren, who pronounced their Church a "dear mother," and solemnly declared the milk wherewith they were nourished was sucked from her breast:—milk, unhap-

pily, which, when it had passed their lips, seemed, like the apocalyptic book, to be converted into gall.

There are three topics, in relation to which the hostility of Puritans to Churchmen was ever apparent, and yielded not till the last moment, if, (so far it can be exerted,) it has yielded still. These are, their opposition to Episcopal missionaries, and their prevention of an American Episcopate: this second subject embracing in it two subsidiary ones—the loss of Confirmation to the whole body of Episcopalians, and almost the loss of means of obtaining Holy Orders for their clergy.

These topics unavoidably run together; and so I shall not attempt a formal separation of them.

No matter what the opinions of Episcopalians might be, whether true or untrue: it was clearly and accurately comprehended, that one of their most solemn rites might be denied them *all*, and the increase of their clergy be most effectually retarded, by defeating every effort for the establishment of an American bishop's see.

Now, were these attempts to defeat and mortify such efforts consistent (I say not with Christian charity) with honor and manliness? To find a feebler adversary at disadvantage, and to improve that disadvantage, were any thing but excusable, save in a necessary war. Little could it redound to the credit, though it might promote the temporal interests of an avowed Christian denomination, to seize such an opportunity eagerly, and improve it systematically. Least of all, however, could such conduct be tolerable in those, who fled a distance broad as the Atlantic, to escape such usurpation; and who, because Christians in England were, *at the best*, but negatively good, came "to practise the positive part of Church reformation in America." And a grievous blot must it be on their escutcheon, who have not only improved such opportunities, but defended and glorified them; while it has been, and still is, their fulsome pro-

fession, that "impositions on conscience" are "the greatest evil on this side hell."*

But it was, unhappily, a literal fact that their system was, to American Episcopalians during our colonial history, a very serious disability. A Puritan believed that his paper ballot could manufacture a priest, as easily as the money and the lay consecration of Micah promoted a Levite, thousands of years ago. (Judges xvii. 7–13.) Now it is not improbable, that even *then* the theory, now developed and fashionable,† that every Christian is a priest, and can do his own preaching and praying, baptize his own children, and administer the Lord's Supper whenever he pleases, existed *in embryo*, and was affording the lovers of liberty some of its disenthralling alleviations. But a poor sorry Churchman could not enjoy such delectable freedom. His system taught him, and his conscience bound him to believe, the costly tenet, that the people can neither make nor unmake a clergyman. And the same system enforced on him, the apostolical fitness of recording his acknowledgment of his baptismal vows before the earthly head of his Church, and of receiving from him the encouragement of a blessing in his Master's Name, and a welcome to all the privileges of his Master's holy and beautiful house. Yet this same system was, to an American Churchman, a most inconvenient and often harassing thing. He must send three thousand miles for his priest, and had little of Micah's silver to tempt him with. The benediction of his spiritual father he must, in all probability, forever forego.

Now did not the Puritans know this? Not a man was there among them but knew it full well; and not a

* Bogue and Bennet's Dissenters, ii. 427.

† See a tract of William Ballantine; the translated works of Neander; Stratten on the Priesthood; and the Socinian Dedication Sermon of Henry Colman, Dec. 1824, at Salem, Mass.—Compare Featley's Anabaptists, 6th edit. p. 123.

man too who ought not to have respected American Episcopalians, for their conscientious and steady adherence to the system of their convictions; since their own alleged adherence to their own system across the ocean, was praised, even to weariness, as a "thrice illustrious" virtue. But, sad inequality! this might not be. Puritans were ever good at *demanding*, yet always slow and chilly as the approaches of a New England summer, in *granting* consideration. The concentrated, the indurated might of their enmity, was therefore marshalled against the entrance of a bishop upon the "holy ground" of that territory, the "exclusive property" of which they had appropriated to their individual selves. And they not only acted thus *here*, but they carried their opposition back to the very soil they had abandoned as unfit for human beings; and endeavored to breed discords in the heart of their father-land, and of that Church out of whose "bowels" they professed, quite solemnly, to have sprung. That venerable Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts,[100] (which can count lustrums in its existence for units in the existence of others oftener applauded,) was absolutely reviled,* because it presumed to allow a herald of peace in Jesus Christ, to preach and administer ordinances within a territory, whose fee was vested indefeasibly in their "sacramental host" alone. Less indeed was said against this ancient association, when its strength was infantile and its servants few. But as it towered to manhood, and began to plant its footsteps in commanding situations, there was a stir seen in the ranks of its opponents. The whisper began to circulate, that the enemy was coming in like a flood, and "fatal accidents," as Noah Hobart called conversions to Episcopacy, might multiply.

[100] See Note 100.

* Reviled, and by Whitefield's example; he all the while pretending to be an Episcopalian!—Gordon's America, i. 147.

By and by, the execration began to be muttered, after the language of the angel, Curse ye Meroz, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, if they come not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. (Judges v. 23.)

A church was erected,* less than a Sabbath-day's journey from the very walls of that College, which was to be for Puritans what Maynooth and St. Omers have been for Jesuits, and to send forth well-disciplined antagonists of an "Anti-christian hierarchy," and practised decriers of the "ill-mumbled mass" of a Common Prayer Book.† This, says Archdeacon Burnaby, who travelled in this country about the time of its erection, (1760,) was considered "the most fatal stroke that could possibly have been levelled at their religion."‡ And it was esteemed, no doubt, a more "fatal accident," because the church in question was sustained by a rector, whom he characterizes as a man of "shining parts, great learning, and pure and engaging manners." Burnaby was right. When Dr. Mayhew opened the flood-gates of his invective against the Propagation Society, under whose auspices Dr. Apthorp commenced his labors at Cambridge, he found in him an adversary who could cope with an assailant in the sharpest onset.§ Dr. Apthorp was

* Christ Church, Cambridge; a beautiful structure, endeared to me by many recollections, still standing on its original site.

† Mr. L. Bacon has, I am told, a new name for it, viz. *Christianity petrified.* I am not surprised at *his* dislike of it; for it talks of the *satisfaction* of the atonement, of original sin, &c., like the old creeds. It *is* ancient and unchanged; may it more and more resemble its basis, the Rock of Ages. Congregationalism is changeful enough to suit the most whimsical. It is the *sandbank* of religion—now here, and now there; like the shores of our great western rivers—shifting with the stream.

‡ Travels, 4to, 3d ed. p. 180.

§ Dr. Caner figured in the controversy, also. Dr. Apthorp closed it; Dr. Mayhew never replied to him. See also Note 101. Chandler's Life of Dr. Johnson, pp. 112, 113.

no ordinary *man:* as a *scholar* he had probably, in his day in America, but few competitors. His letters upon history, intended to display Gibbon's partiality and errors,* and his Warburtonian Lectures, evince an ability and erudition, which need but to be known to be appreciated and admired. But though he shrunk not from the post of danger, while the storm was at its height—though he buffeted the torrent when it roared, with lusty sinews throwing it aside, and stemming it with a heart of controversy; yet, like many a good man, who feared not a tempest's fury, he was exhausted and disheartened by that wearying and fretting petulance, which has been compared to the incessant droppings of a rainy day. Fatigued and disgusted, he at length sought refuge in a clime, more congenial to the faith of his choice and love; which had "mists" perhaps, but none quite so choking as those, amid which Mr. Bancroft's unthrottled fancy delights to rove.

The contest sustained by him, and Dr. Caner, with Dr. Mayhew, seconded by an able tract, (published anonymously,) from the pen of Dr. Secker then Archbishop of Canterbury,† fills an octavo of nearly six hundred pages; (leaving out too some of the tracts I never saw;) and shows, most evidently, the unwasted transmission of that enmity to Episcopacy, which Puritans were once careful to disclaim, but never reluctant to practise and diffuse. The very men who once called God to witness, that while they had breath they would *sincerely*, (O, why did they put that word into the Letter from the Arbella? did they think themselves open to suspicions of dishonesty?) "SINCERELY desire and endeavor the continuance and abundance of the welfare of the Church of England, and the enlargement of her bounds," sent down to future times such a detestation of the Church of England,

* For which Gibbon sarcastically says, that *he* collated him to a good fat benifice.—Gibbon's Life, chap. ix.

† Secker's Works, vi. 417.

that when she would have planted a solitary foot-print on the soil of New England, pens must be dipped in gall to frighten her away, since the musket balls of former days could not be employed as easily*—since, as Justice Story says, "persecution" must become "less frequent, because it was less safe."† What does all this prove, but that a vow like Hannibal's may be taken in reality, if not in form, in days of Christian light; and that a conspiracy like that of the forty Jews against St. Paul, may be virtually entered into by "pilgrims" for peace and liberty, and the most pertinacious and canting devotees of the rights of private judgment. I say canting; for though "the cant of criticism" may to some be the "most tormenting," the cant of illiberal liberalism deserves equal if not higher commemoration. The thing exists now, too, as well as in the days of Puritanism's culmination. There are not a few in New England, still, who, as one happily expressed it, are "bigotted to their liberality." I have never known, in all my readings of Church history, or in my own experience, (and I am somewhat qualified to judge, having for years served the Episcopal Churches in Salem and Cambridge, Massachusetts,) such thorough and wholesale uncharitableness, as among deniers of the Trinity, or sneerers at the Atonement, or among the eulogists of exiles voyaging for unbounded freedom of thought.

It has been intimated, that there was in essence if not in form, a deep and formidable conspiracy of Puritans against Anglo-American Churchmen. It is not an easy thing to resist the conclusion to which this intimation points. For we find these voyagers for charity and liberality, though it was notorious that Confirmation was impossible, and that Ordination was expensive, and attempts to obtain it fruitless or fatal,[102] still resisting an American Episcopate, as ear-

[102] See Note 102.

* Felt's Salem, p. 74. † Misc. p. 66.

nestly and fixedly, as stamp-acts, port-bills, or the dissolution of a charter. The time when musket-balls were made ready for it in 1635, has been alluded to already. Boucher, in his tract on an American Episcopate,* speaks of a failure in some almost successful efforts to establish it, in the reign of Charles the Second. "The decease of Anne," says Mr. Greenwood, "put a stop, for the time, to the proceedings relating to American bishoprics; and though the plan was presented and urged in succeeding reigns, it was never accomplished, and perhaps never came so near accomplishment, as at this first trial."† He says "first trial," but the allusions already made, show how Mr. G. can sometimes be mistaken in facts, as well as in deductions.

What was done in relation to this subject in 1725, when a Congregational Synod was headed by Cotton Mather, who had no objection to being bishop himself; for he was, on Puritan authority, a "sovereign in his dogmas and absolute in power"‡—what was done, I say, at this synod, the purposes of which were cloaked in terms Jesuitically dark, has been related by me in the 182d Number of the Churchman.[103] § The valuable correspondence of the firm and learned Dr. Cutler, then rector of Christ Church, Boston, and previously rector, (as the style then was,) of Yale College ||—of the intrepid and witty John Checkley,¶ who had

[103] See Note 103.

* Sermons, &c. p. 92. † King's Chapel, p. 82.

‡ Hutch. Hist. ii. 292. Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, ix. 13, note.—"Their great ecclesiastical head," *i. e.* Congregational pope. Quincy's Add. p. 33.

§ Compare Bancroft's United States, iii. 391, 400.

|| See Chandler's Life of Johnson, p. 31, et seq. Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, ii. 128, and iv. 297.

¶ Eliot's Biog. Dict. p. 104, for an amusing notice. Dr. Eliot says Checkley believed in nobody's goodness, unless he were a high-churchman. He might have believed, innocently enough, in the goodness of nobody but a Puritan.

just about run through his six months of good behavior, to which a Puritan Court had doomed him for publishing Leslie on Episcopacy—and of several others, collected in the fourth volume of Nichols' Literary Illustrations—throw a flood of light on that page of our ecclesiastical annals. The same temper which that juncture saw, lived on in the children of those who manifested it, and lived through generations like a leprosy.

But it would carry me too far to enter into minutiæ, respecting an era in which the defence of the Church was maintained, and her rights urged, by such men as Johnson, Caner, Beach, Leaming, Wetmore, Chandler, and others. Few, at this day, have either known or seen the fruits of their laborious pens, or are aware how they realized, in their own lives, the prophetic anticipation of the Prayer Book at a baptism, about "the waves of this troublesome world." Suffice it to mention of the first, whose name can never die while Episcopacy survives here, that when he commenced his mission at Stratford, Connecticut, it was a long time before the Puritans would sell him the bare necessaries of life, and he was compelled to obtain them, at great expense and from a distance, by water conveyances, then very precarious. They did not succeed, however, in dislodging him, by the slow terrors of starvation. His meekness conquered; and at last they no longer refused him bread. I have this from an authority not to be disputed: one of his direct descendants. And it is easy of belief on other grounds; for starvation seems to have been a favorite expedient to drive away Episcopal missionaries.*

Between the year 1760, and the Revolution in 1776, the fiercest assault was made upon Episcopacy;† and then, too, some of its ablest advocates made their appearance.

* See Chandler's Johnson, p. 61.

† See "Minutes of the Convention of Delegates from the Synod of

Dr. Mayhew found all his powers of sarcasm and thunder unable to silence such men as Caner and Apthorp; nor could Dr. Chauncey more effectually extinguish Dr. Chandler.* Chandler, (meanly as Allen caricatures him, Dict. p. 248, as a proselyte for preferment,) fought the battles of the Church most manfully. Twice did he come to the rescue, to sustain his 'Appeal to the public in behalf of the Church of England,' and to the very eve of a crisis, which involved his country in the horrors of civil war.[104]

But, as I before said, the details of this era are too numerous for the sketches I have undertaken. The subject, however, which occasioned them, I can hardly pass by; and more particularly, because the groundwork of the controversial writings now referred to has been considered, as one of the mainsprings of our Revolution and severance from the mother country. This doctrine is most distinctly avowed by the second President of these States, in a letter written by him, under date of Dec. 2, 1815, and which is quoted in the New York Evangelist of Nov. 9, 1843.

This doctrine is maintained, doubtless, less to justify that Revolution, than to give Episcopalians an invidious distinction in history; and is raked up at this late day, when much of the old antipathy to Episcopacy seems to be reviving, because of the system's great success. But be that as it may, it is a doctrine in unfortunate collision with the Declaration of Independence, which complains not of *fears* of wrongs, but of *wrongs inflicted.* The British Government never established a bishop here, during our Colonial existence; and to make an apprehension of a fact, rather than

[104] See Note 104.

New-York and Philadelphia, and from the Associations of Connecticut; held *annually* from 1766 to 1775, inclusive."—Hartford, Ct. 1843.

* Even Dr. Allen calls Dr. Chauncey "vehement and extravagant." Biog. Dict. 252, col. a.

a fact itself, a ground for Revolution, is contradicting the very instrument that proclaims our Independence, which is based (as so solemn an instrument should ever be) upon realities and not on fancies. It is unworthy Americans, it is unworthy their cause, to say that a fear of possible future injuries provoked present revolution.

Moreover, they who descanted most largely upon the oppressions and persecutions which an Anglo-American bishop would be likely to inflict, did not, after all, in their hearts, much dread them. The Jacobites, as Dr. Chandler says, had sent bishops to this country as early as about 1723;* and if the Puritans could have induced those bishops to have established sees, rival to those of Canterbury and London, they would have rallied round them with acclamations. No; they did not dread Episcopacy; but it was a good bugbear with which to frighten the timid, and advance political scheming, and so, doubtless, it was made use of to the utmost.[105] It may, thus used, have scared some, exasperated others, and even induced the commission of deeds of violence.

So Dr. Mayhew's sermon on the text "I would they were cut off that trouble you," brought down, at least helped to bring down, a storm of outrage and the assaults of a mob upon Gov. Hutchinson; and the Dr. was sorry for it when it was all too late.† The Governor was an opportune subject for the Dr. with which to inflame the public mind; and so probably was Episcopacy, or any other subject, by means of which the community could be roused to indignation against England. The Dr. repented of the mischief he indirectly did the Governor, and said his whole estate should go, if it could recall his sermon. If all his anti-trinitarianism could

[105] See Note 105.

* Life of Johnson, p. 38. Har. Adams's New England. p. 212.

† Hutch. Hist. iii. 123, the English edit.

have gone for the mischief he has indirectly done Episcopacy, he might have blessed God for the riddance. But he was man whose temperament, if warm, was not vindictive; and we can easily believe his head outwent his heart, in respect to the Church, as well as Governor Hutchinson, and let his memory rest in peace.

President Adams had an unquestionable Puritan aversion to Episcopacy. His sneer at Dr. Apthorp, in the Letter alluded to, fully evinces it. He speaks of him as "hot from Oxford, and still more warmed by holy orders from Episcopal hands;" and thus, also, when the frost of fourscore winters ought to have made him write far, far more coolly. No wonder, then, that he should have magnified Episcopacy into one of those causes which, as much as any thing else, (so his letter has it,) conduced to the horrors of revolution. And there is the less wonder at it; for he seemed to think one thing a cause of the Revolution at one time, and another at another. "Writs of assistance" were the chief evil in his view, at the very time that Drs. Mayhew and Apthorp were carrying on their controversy, between 1760 and 1765.* But in 1815, he rather remembers Episcopacy as the head and front of American wrongs. The former was his theme at the age of thirty, and the latter at fourscore!

One thing more, and this point shall not be argued further; for really it is unworthy our adversaries—our countrymen too—to cast our faith into our teeth as a cause of revolution and disaster, when the blood of Episcopalians flowed as freely for their country's rights as that of Puritans, and when under God, as all confess, our liberties are more indebted to an Episcopalian than to any body. Why will they so constantly and so studiously forget two facts, that should be an everlasting excuse with Americans, that the

* Allen's Biog. Dict. p. 9. Holmes's Annals, ii. 107. Gordon's Amer. Rev. i. 141.

first General of our armies, and the first chaplain of our Congress, (George Washington and William White,) were Churchmen, both of them?

But what I was about to say is this. Men judge differently of the causes of the Revolution, according to facts more immediately under their own review. President Adams once thought writs of assistance brought it on. Judge Trowbridge thought the putting Governor Hutchinson into a place wanted by James Otis, a procuring cause; and no doubt, as it affected *personal* interests, this was a cause of fatal power.* But Dr. Franklin in his "Cool Thoughts," written *before* the Revolution, (and there was no cooler thinker among all our politicians,) did not hesitate to say, "But this event [the introduction of a bishop] will happen neither sooner nor later, for our being, or not being, under a royal government."† And with this sagacious, almost prophetic man's judgment, I am willing to leave the matter. Episcopacy, in itself considered, had nothing to do with provoking our Revolution. That politicians introduced it as a by-play for their purposes, when they were waspish, and caricatured it as Lyceum, Lecturers and New England Reviewers now do, to awake scorn and sustain irascibility, can be safely admitted.[106] But if this makes Episcopacy criminal, then Christianity itself is not exempt from censure. Indirectly, that has created many a contest; for its very Author, surveying its future history, said he came not to send peace on earth, but a sword.

This may suffice, I hope, to vindicate Episcopacy from

[106] See Note 106.

* Eliot's Biog. Dict. pp. 274, 354, 355.—I might say the slitting and rolling mill act was rather the cause. Bancroft confesses it was "the mercantile system and its consequences."—See Gordon's Amer. Rev. i. 118. Bancroft's United States, iii. 384, 390.

† Works, Sparks' ed. iv. 89.

the miserable aspersion now cast upon it, of being a disturber of American peace, and of compelling Americans to resist its tyrannical encroachments at the point of the bayonet. Let us now go back to the location in history, where we supposed ourselves, before the episode just finished became necessary. In imagination, (though it requires no great effort with the Minutes of the Conventions of Presbyterian and Congregational delegates before one's eyes,) we see Puritanical exertions without number or cessation, all levelled against Episcopacy, and especially against the completion of its system in America, by the introduction of a bishop. Let us then suppose the tables turned: the last made foremost, and the foremost last. Let us fancy it had been in the power of Churchmen to have denied Congregationalists some material rite, which their faith demanded. Fancy a succession from the "Gifted Brethren" to have been indispensable, and that these brethren, like bishops, might not hoist a sail to convey them from British shores. And then fancy, as a consequence, that unless Churchmen chose to be accommodating, and to alter the state of things, an inheritor of the full powers of these "Gifted Brethren" could not be had, short of the hazard and expense of a journey of six thousand miles. Or further, suppose as a fair equivalent for the revenue, which Puritans, in the day of *their* power, extorted from Churchmen for the support of their clergy, these Churchmen, in the day of *their* power, had enacted a statute that the mighty ballot, which can convert a layman into one of "God's anointed ministers," should be destitute of this divine virtue, unless duly engrossed on STAMPED PAPER.

Oh, how the *same* essential circumstances would totally have altered the *same* cases! How would the welkin have echoed outcries against domineering pride, malignant tyranny, diabolical oppressions—against "a corrupt, antichristian hierarchy," "a false and superstitious religion,"

priestly impositions," and "impositions on conscience," than which nothing, say Messrs. Bogue and Bennet, are more intolerable save one thing—the very bottomless pit! As Mr. Shepard, (formerly a minister of Cambridge, Mass., and of much celebrity for the fame of his sect and day,) ascribed to Laud's "extreme malice and secret venom,"* a prohibition from preaching within his diocese; so would thousands have ascribed such lets and hindrances, to motives as infernal as these. And if, in spite of them, they had still maintained their stand, and perpetuated, and increased their sect, when, where, would terms have been found, eloquent enough to express their fortitude, and to magnify, to consecrate, to canonize their devotion? An apotheosis would hardly have exalted it too much.

But where are the volumes which record the clamorous remonstrances of Churchmen, beneath such ponderous oppressions as these had been? Where are the tales, or the poems, which as Bancroft says have been evoked by Puritan story;† and, as he and their gauntleted champions would

* Here we see one of the peculiarities of Puritanism developed. It can coolly indulge in the most ferocious ascriptions of evil motives. Such texts as Matt. vii. 1, and 1 Cor. xiii. 7, are nothing before its self-assumed infallibility.—The unfortunate archbishop could not escape censure any way. Shepard reviled him for his severity, and Wells, another New England minister, for his moderation. He spoke kindly to Wells, when he was Bishop of London, and, as his diocesan, suspended him. For this kindness, Wells told him he had acted against his conscience. (See Laud's Troubles, pp. 213, 214.) Was this Wells, as Laud calls him the Wells who, as Chalmers says, was appointed an agent by Massachusetts, to go to England with Hibbins and Hugh Peters in 1641? (Annals, p. 172.) If so, he might have been selected from his known enmity to the archbishop: not to say that he thought himself in the way of his commission, to visit and worry him, as it seems he did, during his imprisonment.

† U. States, first edit. i. 338.—Mr. Bancroft is ungallant as well as uncandid. His *first* edition here singles out Mrs. Hemans, for her poetry in praise of the Puritans. In his *seventh* it is all—all gone! See vol. i. 313,

no doubt be ready to maintain, up to the hilt in controversy, have hallowed Puritan memories with "all the dread sublimities of song"? Ah, almost like the solitary fugitives from the wrecks and ruins of the Patriarch's princely heritage, might the present writer say of the wrongs of Episcopalians, he only is left to tell of them. Not an elegy, perhaps, can a Churchman find over his brethren, who have been buried under a hostility as unsparing as that of Cheynell at Chillingworth's grave.[107] "Unwept, unhonored, and unsung," they plodded their weary way, over a rough and thorny path; or, with the Psalmist, heard deep calling unto deep at the noise of the water-spouts. Poor Boucher has indeed left a precious volume, the effusions of fervent and fearless Churchmanship, showing how, like the workmen of Nehemiah, his brethren had to build with one hand and hold a weapon with the other.* But Boucher is fast descending into "dusty death": his pages will soon say to corruption, 'Thou art my mother,' and the pall of oblivion cover them. His sermon, or tract, on an American Episcopate, few American Episcopalians may ever see. We have no Plymouth Rock for our "blarney-stone,"† around which to cluster as a nucleus .We give no dinners to our eulogists, and drink no wine to the *manes* of predecessors, "of whom the world was not worthy." We neither pay nor flatter

[107] See Note 107.

---

* Disc. Pref. pp. xlviii. xlix.

† "Blarney" takes its name from the castle of Blarney, near Cork, in Ireland. Tradition says, of all who crept up to the highest pinnacle of this castle, on their hands and knees, and kissed its corner-stone, that they were ever after "endowed with extraordinary powers of loquacity and persuasion." Brady's Varieties of Literature. London, 1826. pp. 26, 27.)

Plymouth Rock has gifted its devotees with loquacity enough; but its powers of persuasion are beginning to fail. Episcopacy has a foothold in Plymouth at last!

men, to give us gratuitous defence or unprompted praise. Years ago I awakened the apprehensions of some of my fellow-Churchmen, lest I should tell too much *for* my brethren, and too much *against* their enemies; and not improbably I may do the same again. They would have me do, as Dr. Watts would have had Daniel Neal do, in his history of New England: a precious item among curiosities of literature, which will bear, and, it may be, requires repetition. Neal told a straighter tale about the colonies, than he could afford to do about the mother country. And so meagre was his gain, that he was duly taken to task for not "mollifying" certain "relations," and not "leaving out" certain "laws," the bare mention of which was "insulting" and a "scandal."* So, doubtless, those who are undesiredly tender of Puritan reputation, would have these sketches inscribed on silken velvet. Fraternal condolence! verily, it will have its reward. Its commiserated objects will grasp every concession with characteristic avidity, trample it under feet, and turning again rend the giver.

I know the mode of requital by melancholy experience; and rather than be wounded afresh by its grating recompenses, would hazard the lacerations of expected controversy.[108] Much rather would I endure the reproaches of the New Englander, *e. g.*, for agreement with the Church and with myself, than enjoy such equivocal praise as it bestows on the author of the "Mysteries Opened." Unblessed are all those plaudits which are given to one's intellect, at the expense of his consistency. They are but "as a very lovely song, of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument:" a single, clear "Well done" of conscience, is worth ten thousand thousand of them.

So, then, I aspire not to the adulation of those whose

[108] See Note 108.

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st series, v. 201.

praise, like the earth in Pharaoh's plentiful years, would yield "by handfuls," if I would only allow these pages to be as lean in unpalatable facts, as Pharaoh's kine. I prefer to be condemned as a vindicator of my brethren, sooner than be suspected of pandering for the flattery of their opponents. I am under small obligation to extenuate, when my faintest allowance will be transmuted into a ringing accusation: "Clementia liberum arbitrium habet; non sub formulâ, sed ex æquo et bono judicat; et absolvere illi licet, et quanti vult, taxare litem."* I would rather give my "two mites," unalloyed, into the treasury of their praise, who toiled and sacrificed and died, *in* and *for* the faith which my heart cherishes and my mind reveres. Embalmed be their memory, venerated their example, and enduring the influence of the "doctrine, discipline, and worship" they dared to establish, and labored to maintain. In their belief may we live, with their hopes may we die, and in their "goodly fellowship" may we be numbered in "glory everlasting." And of the Church to which they clung with such firm zeal, would I exclaim in the beautiful apostrophe of the dying Tobit: (Tobit, xiii. 14.)

"O blessed are they which love thee, for they shall rejoice in thy peace!
Blessed are they which have been sorrowful for all thy scourges!
For they shall rejoice for thee, when they have seen all thy glory;
And shall be glad for ever."

P. S.—It may not be amiss to add, that if a text from the Apocrypha could sanction the abuse of the Church in a Puritan oath, as was seen in Letter Second, it may surely be sufficient to authorize something in her praise. And, (another thing,) the general subject of the present letter might have carried me much further than it has done, in relation to *ecclesiastical* "pains and penalties," endured by Churchmen under a Puritan regime. It were not difficult,

* Seneca, de Clementia, lib. ii. ch. vii.

also, to show how Churchmen suffered in their temporal and general interests from those who, as Mr. Bancroft would fain persuade us, never persecuted for an opinion—he might have added, to round off both his sentence and sentiment—more than "the Holy and Apostolic Court of the Inquisition." William Bollan, Esq., for example, suffered not a little for his attachment to the Episcopal Church; although "Mr. Hancock declared in the House of Representatives, [of Massachusetts,] that there was *no man* to whom the colonies were more indebted, or whose friendship had been more sincere." He had been the faithful and unwearied agent of Massachusetts in England, and was dropped because he was a Churchman. "Mr. Mauduit," says Eliot, "succeeded him; a worthy man, but whose only merit to raise him to this station was his being a leading character of the dissenters." That is, they endured Bollan for a while, as they did Gov. Winthrop; but whenever their genuine temper could safely break out, or no longer be repressed, they proscribed and doomed him without hesitation. "We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." They exemplified this text.*

As to Mauduit's *personal* insignificance, Eliot is right; but he had not the true secret of his appointment, as the agent of Massachusetts. He had connections with men in power, and he was wanted to oppose an American bishop! This secret is let out in a letter from Thomas Hollis. See Peirce's Hist. Harv. University, pp. 280, 281.

* See Eliot's Biog. Dict. pp. 73, 74, 276. Tudor's Otis, p. 115.

LETTER XIV.

I HAVE now said as much, perhaps, on the subject of Puritan treatment of Churchmen, as my limits allow; and far more than my Puritan neighbors will say deserves as much as bare toleration. But I cannot as yet abandon my undertaking; which is to prove, that if any should be silent on the "blarney-subjects" of tyranny, oppression, persecution, and the like, they and their counterparts should be the persons. It is incumbent on me, therefore, to complete my argument, by showing how the Puritans treated other Christian denominations, against whom they had not the shadow of a reason for such charges, as they brought against the Church of England. If it can be demonstrated, that it mattered little whether one were Baptist, Quaker, Romanist, Gortonist, Hutchinsonian, Seeker, Familist, Morellian, or even Presbyterian, so long as he differed from themselves—if *all* "dissenters" from their Establishment were, *ipso facto*, "New-Lights" and "Separatists," and visited with indiscriminate denunciation, then the question has *all* force, What right have such people, or their advocates, to vilify others for being *not* altogether, *nor* almost, as exclusive as themselves?

Speaking of their treatment of those who dissented from them, Callender, the Baptist, in his Historical Discourse, bears the following testimony. "The chief leaders and the major part of the people soon discovered themselves as fond of uniformity, and as loath to allow liberty of conscience to such as differed from themselves, as those from whose power

they had fled."* With this charge from his denomination, in view, (which seems in far better keeping with its principles, than to edit and endorse a history of the Puritans, as Mr. Choules has done that of Neal—and far less absurd than he is pleased to call the apostolical succession,)[109] I propose to show, that Callender is quite correct. I cannot go as largely into the history of the Baptists, languishing under Puritan oppressions, as I did into that of Churchmen; nor should it be expected of me. But I may exhibit, and I can exhibit, some characteristic specimens of the manner in which, to adopt the language of the Hon. Mr. Savage, the nursing fathers of the Commonwealth levelled their battery against some of the most sincere and orthodox Christians, according with them even in the mint, anise, and cummin of all forms, or rejection of forms, except this single one of pædobaptism.†

Belknap could dispute Hutchinson about the quarrelsomeness of the Puritans in Holland; and he certainly was any thing but a friend to the English "Babylon." Yet he does not hesitate to admit, that the Puritans had been but a short time in this country, before they outstripped their 'dear mother' in the art of parental subjugation.‡ He soon after says, "The Anabaptists, fined and banished, flocked to that new settlement, and many of the Quakers also took refuge there; so that Rhode Island was in those days looked upon as the drain or sink of New England."§

With these premises let us now contemplate the opening of a scene, which, says Mr. Savage, with manly yet pitying candor, is regarded "with painful emotions," even by those who hold the Puritans "in the highest veneration."|| Their

[109] See Note 109.

* R. I. Hist. Coll. iv. 69.
† Savage's Wint. ii. 174, note.
‡ Farmer's Belknap, i. 43.
§ Ibid. i. 47.
|| See his excellent note, Savage's Wint. ii. 174.

battery of insinuations and assertions, as he graphically calls it, is levelled against that inconsiderable body, from which "no danger could be rationally apprehended." They are styled in their classic nomenclature, "incendiaries of commonwealths," "infectors of persons in *main* matters of religion," "troublers of churches in all places where they have been;" and are charged with fraudulently concealing their heresy, "as other heretics used to do;" and the conclusion of the whole affair is, that they must decamp from the colony—banishment is the gentlest mercy to be expected for opinions pronounced literally "damnable."*

Soon after this law was enacted, one Thomas Painter, (the Baptists should memorize him as their proto-martyr,) who had led a somewhat thriftless life, was wrought upon by the preaching of the Baptists, and professed a belief in their tenets. Thereupon he refused to let his child be baptized. Straightway he is arraigned before a Puritan court of 'High Commission,' and commanded to abdicate his domestic patriarchate. But poor though Painter might be in filthy lucre, he was not devoid of that which in his judges was a glory, resolved and dogged repugnance to constraining authority. He believed as fully in the "tenent" of resistance, as they did in the "tenent" of persecution. With him, as with them, saving a slight difference of application only, the true doctrine was "rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." So his untutored spirit must be initiated into the "Discipline of the Secret;" *alias* into that state of salvation from prisons and the stake, called "passive obedience and non-resistance." His purse, (alas poor starveling!) was too lean for flaying; so, like commuting Shylock, they consent to take in lieu the pound of flesh. He is speedily whipped; (probably with the "corded" and "knotted" scourge, pre-

* See the law against the Baptists, in Hazard's Coll. i. 538. Benedict's Baptists, i. 359. Knowles's Roger Williams, 201. Also for "damnable:" Anc. Charters, &c. 120.

scribed in his day as error's catholicon;*) though he endured the cuttings of the lash as heroically as Bastwick did the abscission of his ears, and with equally unflinching honesty.† But this might be borne rather more tolerably, than "the oil of joy" which Puritan commiseration poured into his bleeding wounds. "He was very poor," says Winthrop's Journal; "so as no other but corporal punishment could be fastened upon him, he was ordered to be whipped." ‡

And that was not all. It was then (Mr. Bancroft had this in his eye, perhaps, when he says the Puritans never persecuted for opinions;§ but he did not see so honestly as even Mr. Felt, who on p. 233 of his Salem Annals, says, Baptists were threatened with banishment, and in fact ordered to leave the colony, unless they renounced their opinions), it was then, I say, deliberately averred, that this wretched sufferer "was ordered to be whipped, *not for his opinion.*" And in the same temper was it similarly said, long afterwards by Dr. Morse, "As the original inhabitants of this State [Rhode Island] were persecuted, at least in their own opinion, for the sake of conscience," &c.|| What! not punished for opinions? not persecuted for conscience' sake, except as they imagined themselves to be so? In the name of justice, for what then did they mangle Thomas Painter, and (perhaps still more barbarously) Obadiah Holmes?¶ Oh, the *opinions* of such men required them to discountenance a ceremony, which the magistrates, supreme in Church as well as State, had autocratically exacted.

* Gough's Quakers, i. 347; and ii. 40, 49. The lashes, Gough says, were as thick as a *man's* little finger, and the stick so long the executioner had to wield it with both hands.

† Harris's Charles I. pp. 230, 231.

‡ Savage's Winth. ii. 175.

§ Bancroft, i. 463.

|| Geog. 1792, p. 210.

¶ "I can fill sheets of paper with the sufferings of the Baptists, as well as others, within your precincts," says an authority as old as 1723.—See Benedict's Baptists, i. 472.

They declined obeying, and so were punished, not for their opinions, but for resistance to lawful authority. Transcendent logic! I wonder if it was learned in those Universities, where "The Holy Roman Church" gives infallible tuition; for her boast is, that she never persecutes heretics for their *errors*. No, never. She only brings refractory children to the powers that be; who take them from her maternal arms, and deal with them, after the canon of the Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms, "as the matter shall require."

This giving over into the hands of the Civil Power, those with whom the Church is dissatisfied, is a favorite fancy of Romanists; for we find Sir Thomas More advancing it, as one of the excellencies of his model commonwealth. Of the citizens of Utopia, when visited with sacerdotal displeasure, he says, "if they do not very quickly satisfy the priests of the truth of their repentance, they are seized on by the Senate, and punished for their impiety."* And an equally favorite fancy does it appear to have been with the Puritans, in *their* model commonwealth, to make ecclesiastical sinners, sinners by statute law. Most especially was this their fancy, when the priesthood sounded a key-note, and chose to have it so. The *flamen* of Massachusetts was as dominant as the *flamen* of Utopia.†

We have just seen what a sad predicament Baptists were reduced to on Puritan soil, by the formalities of legislation; and Painter's case shows us, abundantly, that Puritan statutes against heresy were something more than sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. It was a grievous

* More's Utopia, edit. 1684, p. 187.

† Benedict shows that the Puritans in England were bitter enemies of the Baptists, as well as the Puritans of Massachusetts. Even Richard Baxter was a fierce foe to them. Cromwell, however, rather countenanced them.—Benedict, i. 201, 204.

law by which they suffered; and the more so, for there was coupled with it a sort of non-intercourse or exclusion act, "levelled against strangers. No person could harbor any stranger more than a few days, without the direct permission of the magistrates. These laws were not unrighteous only, they were deplorably impolitic. Even merchants, as Winthrop confesses, petitioned for their repeal. And some of the religious part of the community remonstrated, because their new-born polity, sustained by such virtually Romish methods, was suffering in the esteem of the more tolerant at home. "The petitioners complained to the court, of the offence taken thereat by many godly in England; and that some churches there did thereupon profess to deny to hold communion with such of our churches as should resort thither."* This combined effort made out a strong case, and produced a deep impression. "Many of the court," writes the journalist, "were well inclined, for these and other considerations, to have had the execution of those laws to have been suspended, [not *repealed* to be sure, but suspension is better than nothing,] suspended for a season." It was an auspicious juncture. Light began to twinkle in the dark canopy, which had been drawn over the fortunes of the stranger and the Baptist. But it was a meteor flash. The Elders—the cabinet pontifical—are informed of the progress of affairs. They forthwith remonstrate, and as usual, with entire effect; their dogmas are received like the prophecies of the Delphic Oracle. The petitioners who had begun to hope, were repulsed with rudeness. No retraction is made in the language of persecution: no possible construction allowed to be placed upon it, by which its *practical* severity could be gently modified. The Elders had spoken; and the wavering court became as imperious as the Divan of the Sultan. "In answer to the petition of

* Savage's Wint. ii. 250.

Em. Downing, &c., it is ordered, that the laws in their petition mentioned, shall not be *altered* or *explained at all.*"*

Ah! verily, the times were degenerate, and could not be trusted. When the Elders contemplated the encroachments of heresy, they thought more of Horace than of the Millenium, and with him said,

> Damnosa quid non imminuit dies;
> Aetas parentum pejor avis tulit,
> Nos nequiores, mox daturos,
> Progeniem vitiosorem.

A dozen folios like Hakewill's,[110] and written with all its power as well as charity, could not have induced them to believe, that mankind might be safe unless clothed with the strait waistcoat of Calvinism, and led by the iron collar of Puritan discipline. With them, toleration was an abortion, a perfect monstrosity. It was a root out of a dry ground—it had neither form nor comeliness in their eyes —there was no beauty in it, why they should desire it.

And here, perhaps, I may be thought careering among fancies of my own, and uttering assertions which have no more substance than the "sabbattical snow-broth," which Milton (I believe) used to call every sermon, that was not redolent of the *isms* to which he was partial. We must soon notice one, whom our Baptist neighbors claim as the father of toleration in this country; and a few quotations will reflect influence on what has been said already, and be no unapt introduction to what is to come up presently.

That toleration was excluded from the very idea of religion by Puritanism, is evident from the fact that, in the Larger Catechism, one of the heinous sins against Heaven

[110] See Note 110.

* Savage's Wint. ii. 265, note.

under the Second Commandment—a virtual commission of idolatry—is the "tolerating a false religion."* Many will perhaps look into some edition of that Catechism, published now, and say I am incorrect. Let them know, that the loss of the quoted words is only a modern improvement. The un-expurgated original reads as I state; as any one can satisfy himself, by examining an edition as early as my own: viz. of 1768. When the sin of toleration ceased to be a sin, I know not.† The edition quoted proves, that toleration continued its sinful existence to the verge of the American Revolution. Possibly it survived it, but I have not the means of ascertaining, as no *American* edition of the Assembly's Catechism, unless of quite recent date, has fallen into my hands. The Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms virtually entertain the idea avowed by the Catechism, when they say the civil magistrate is "to put forth his coercive power as the matter shall require."‡ But these, too, have fallen into desuetude, or have been taught the German doctrine of accommodation; and when they began to give "an uncertain sound" it is equally impossible to tell.

It is of little consequence. Suffice it to know what genuine Puritanism has been; and also, that its disavowal of toleration has been no inoperative theory. That this disavowal was no mere idea, is evident from the fact, that Pym once boldly broached it in a Puritanic British Parliament. He "asserted that it was the duty of the legislature to establish true religion and to punish false;" and how cordially they believed him, and acted out his doctrine, history has recorded with many a sigh and tear.§

* Compare the ministers' petition to Parliament in 1644, to suppress "ruinating schisms and damnable heresies."—Rushworth's Collections, v. 780.

† The English edition of Blair and Bruce of 1831, p. 268, retains it also. I have seen no later copy. An early American edition I have not been able to obtain, after many efforts.

‡ Chap. xvii. Sect. 9.

§ Brit. Crit. xv. p. 74.

This, how ever, is quite enough toshow, how, in England, Puritanism, though it had once groaned for toleration, made others afterwards groan for its own lack of it. Come we now to the land where it was (poetically) an exile for the pearl of great price, the enjoyment of an unmolested conscience. Did it there display no anxiety to molest the consciences of others? Let us see.

And first of all Master Cotton, whom thy contemporaries esteem so "famous,"* I call thee upon the stand. Hear his "awful words," as Shepard truly characterizes them; though he quotes them in his "Eye-Salve," merely to startle his readers with Cotton's formidable name. "It was toleration that made the world anti-christian, and the Church never took hurt by the punishment of heretics." Again: "The Lord keep us from being bewitched with the whore's cup, lest while we seem to detest and reject her with open face of profession, we do not bring her in by a back door of *toleration*, and so come at last to drink deeply in the cup of the Lord's wrath, and be filled with the cup of her plagues."†

Shepard was a worthy pupil of Master Cotton; for he goes if possible a step beyond him, and ascribes toleration to the Father of Lies, in propriâ personâ. "'Tis Satan's policy," says he, "to plead for an indefinite and boundless toleration; as Chemnitius excellently shows from those words, Mark i. 24, 'Let us alone.' He calls it *diabolica machinatio in conciliationibus religionum;* i. e. Christ may have his kingdom, if he will let Satan alone with his, and so both of them live lovingly and quietly together."† So

* "A glory to both Englands," says Hubbard. N. E. p. 553.—Puritans have never been niggardly in their praises of *one another.*

† Bloody Tenent washed &c., pp. 132, 192.—In his tract against Hendon's animadversions, he calls toleration "a more filthy harlot than was Helena."—Tract, 1656, p. 5.

‡ Eye-Salve, an Election Sermon in 1672, p. 14.

Shepard not only asserts his doctrine, but with the help of the profound Chemnitius establishes it, with due exegetical propriety. My readers may perhaps wish to know whether this is the same "good hater" of persecution, who said that Bishop Laud, (not yet Archbishop,) when rebuking him, "shook as if he had been haunted with an ague fit, and, in his apprehension, by reason of his extreme malice and secret venom." For the credit of human nature, I am enabled to say, *not exactly*. However, he was his *son*, and "distinguished for his erudition, prudence, modesty, and integrity."* Eliot calls the Eye-salve sermon, at the election for Governor, &c., "a constellation of wisdom, learning, and faithfulness."† Had Eliot lived in 1672, he could hardly have pitched his eulogy upon a higher key; and I hope this will be remembered, in connexion with other quotations from his Dictionary—those for example which relate to Mauduit and Wm. Bollan.

We see how fearless Shepard was in 1672. That period must have been a famous one: the mantle of Endicott, perhaps, formed one of its venerated relics. The very year succeeding heard as loud thunder against this luckless subject of toleration. "I look upon toleration," says President Oakes of Harvard University, (and that gentleman, when a minister, is considered *ex officio* the Congregational bishop of Massachusetts,) "I look upon toleration, as the first-born of all abominations." This too was said in an Election sermon; and as that, according to Belknap, "may generally be accounted the echo of the public voice," it is the unanimous dictum of a Puritan community.‡

Of all Puritan classics, however, on the subject of toleration, Mr. Ward, the author of the "Simple Cobbler of Aggawam," [Ipswich,] bears away the palm. He makes it

* Allen's Dict. p. 690. † Eliot's Dict. p. 426.

‡ Farmer's Belknap. i. 45.

so ineffably revolutionary, that it empties on earth the contents of the bottomless pit, and overturns the Throne itself of the Absolute Supreme. Speaking in one place of a shoal of sects, which toleration would disenthral, he describes it as, "In a word, room for hell above ground." In another he says, in a figure I never saw paralleled, "To authorize an untruth by a toleration of State, is to build a sconce against the walls of heaven, to batter God out of his chair."*

I will give but one quotation more, and that shall be from Hubbard, the historian, to show how the Puritans abated their intolerance, by the most studied gradations—conforming it carefully to those times, when, as Justice Story has told us, persecution became less frequent because it was less safe. "And indeed," says he, "let the experience of all reformed churches be consulted withal, and it will appear that disorder and confusion of the Church will not be avoided, by all the determination, advice, and counsel, of synods or other messengers of churches, unless they be a *little acuated* † by the *civil authority*. All men are naturally so wedded to their own apprehensions, that unless there be a coercive power to restrain, the order and rule of the Gospel will not be attended."‡

And these are the men, who thought Archbishop Laud "the chief of sinners," because, esteeming themselves too fondly "wedded to their own apprehensions," he employed some of their own beloved "coercive power," and "acuated" church discipline "a little" by the civil authority, that they might attend to what he, as their spiritual guide, deemed the Gospel's order and rule! These are the men,

* Simple Cobbler, new Edit., pp. 6, 11. The first edit. dates from 1647.

† Many may suppose this a mistake for *actuated*, but I am right: and so is Hubbard. "Acuated" means *made sharp as a needle*. And that is what Hubbard wished to say. Only he put in a salvo—"a little."

‡ New England, p. 551.

who, without the slightest hesitancy, could ascribe "extreme malice and secret venom" to one, who was bound by oath to maintain uniformity, and therefore declined permitting them to roam about the land, lawless as the wind, and to mildew Church and State ad libitum with their blasts of vain doctrine! These are the men, who, or whose fathers, had brought Laud to the block, because he was as impracticable as they themselves were! Laud would not listen to the remonstrances of his enemies: they even surpassed him; for they would not listen to the remonstrances of their friends. Their best friends in England remonstrated with them, in behalf of the oppressed and persecuted Baptists and Quakers. But it was all in vain. "O the sweetness of supremacy," says old Fuller, "though in never so small a circuit!"* "Intolerant principles were so deeply implanted in the inhabitants of New England, that all efforts to eradicate them, at this period, proved ineffectual."†

Such were the men, who denounced the intolerance of the Church of England.‡ But a few years previous, and you would have thought them (in words that is,) the most disinterested champions for liberty of conscience the world ever saw. Toleration! oh it was their favorite and ever unworn theme, when they wanted to inflict their "levellisme"§ in Church and State upon an audience in a cathedral, whose revenues they might spoil as lawfully as Israelites could Egyptians.

But, one was now approaching, who would make it a theme even for the "Meeting-House," and commend it to

* Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 141.

† Hannah Adams' New England, p. 117. Wynne's America, i. 91.

‡ Well did Roger Williams remind them of this. "Yourselves pretend libertie of conscience; but alas, it is but selfe, the great God selfe, only to yourselves." Mass. H. Coll. 1st Ser. i. 281.—Knowles's R. Williams, p. 399.

§ See the expressive term in Hutchinson's Collect. pp. 300, 301.

their own ears in such piercing words, that like some of old, (Luke iv. 28, 29,) who professed greater *purity* than others, not a few "were filled with wrath, and rose up and thrust him out of the city." "He, passing through the midst of them, went his way"—was not to be found, when a warrant was issued to arrest him—or Witch-hill, or one of the summits of Tri-mountain, might have told a tale, to make the rest of St. Luke's language applicable—"cast him down headlong."

I cannot attempt a full sketch of the far-famed Roger Williams. Mr. Bancroft has devoted many pages to him, and calls him "the apostle of intellectual liberty;"* while professor Knowles has written his memoirs, with pains-taking zeal and some fortitude, in a duodecimo of 389 pages, with an appendix of nearly fifty more. Mr. Knowles' book is well worthy perusal, by all who want the Baptist version of those vituperations, both legislative and ecclesiastical, written and spoken, ancient and modern, with which the Puritans and their champions have assailed the respectable, and now very extensive denomination, of which he was a member. And I have no very distressing doubts, whether many of the Baptists themselves would not think that Mr. Choules might spend his time more profitably, in reading some, at least, of the pages of his brother Knowles, than in revising and perpetuating those of Daniel Neal.

Williams began life with, if possible, more thorough Puritanism than his brethren. But, coupled with their attachment to their customary dogmas in theology, he cherished some sentiments which augured unfavorably to their permanent ascendency and prolonged intolerance. He was suspicious, *e. g.* of certain meetings of the ministers; "fear-

* How can Puritan writers wonder, that Ap. Laud's treatment of Puritans should read as it does to Churchmen, when an author like J. Q. Adams calls Roger Williams a revolutionist, and the setter up of a conventicle.

ing that they might grow in time to a presbytery or superintendency, to the prejudice of the churches' liberties."* Presbytery, some how or other, seems to be a fearful thing, whether to rulers or the ruled, the monarch or the people. King James dreaded it, because, said he, "Then, Jack and Tom and Will and Dick shall meet and censure me and my Council."† Roger Williams dreaded it, as a foe to popular liberty. And he is not alone in his apprehension; particularly among his own denomination at the present day. Even now, it is feared, that voluntary meetings of the ministers, meetings which the *churches* neither advise nor authorize, may usurp power that never was acceded to them, and sway an influence rather too pontifical.[111] Williams knew, by experience probably, that ecclesiastics become as it were professionally positive; and if they appear to be, or profess to be, more devout than others, are apt to claim proportionate immunities.‡ Perhaps he therefore thought, they should not associate in business conclave, but as representing congregations, and should allow a neutralizing mixture of the more democratic laity. But he was not jealous of cumulative power in ecclesiastics only, he was quite as much so of self-enlarging prerogatives in magistrates. These *might*, and, as the event proves most mournfully, *did* become lawgivers for a religious dispensation. And here, no doubt, was the core of his gangrenous heresy. The fathers of New England hated the union of Church and State, most de-

[111] See Note 111.

* Knowles, p. 56. † Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 188.

‡ No wonder that Cotton Mather, who would have made a tolerable pope, said he had a windmill in his head.—Magnalia. ii. 430.—There were far worse *sinners* in New England than Roger, whose names Mather could not write, as he says, "with any blots upon them."—Magnalia, i. 221.—But Roger was a *heretic* of the first magnitude, and a Puritan could no sooner forget to blast him, than would the Inquisition.

voutly, on their natal soil. But they effectually reversed the adage of Horace, that those—

> ——" who through the venturous ocean range,
> Not their own passions, but the climate change."

They felt their minds " new-opened," by the stirring and cleansing winds of this busiest of atmospheres; and found that the power of the magistrate, if it might " acuate" Church-law a little for *themselves*, could prevent, as Hubbard coolly tells us, disorder and confusion.

But Roger Williams would not give place to this doctrine by subjection: no, not for an hour. *Suum cuique* was his uncompromising motto: Puritan frowns, menaces, anathemas,* and " bloody tenets," to the contrary notwithstanding. The magistrate has nothing to do with the offences of mere opinions, was his stern position; and would have been to this day, though an ex-president of these States, who can see no sin in disturbing our southern brethren to the utmost, should pronounce him revolutionary and seditious.† He is represented as a truly mild and inoffensive man, conciliatory, forgiving, and liberal; but impracticable as an oak under forceful tutoring, and bold as a lion, to look into the very face and eyes of indignant and conspiring opposition. But he was unsustained; though loved and honored almost to veneration, by a flock of which he was the pastor. He flies for a time to Plymouth; after a while returns, is welcomed by his intimates with eager and fond solicitude, is harassed by his former foes, and at length compelled to take refuge in banishment, from a storm whose " floods" would have " cruelly drowned" him.

Yet, testifies Mr. Knowles, (p. 75) and, so far as I know,

* Hubbard says his understanding was fly-blown !—New England, p. 189.

† See Hon. J. Q. Adams' Historical Discourse, pp. 25–30.—Boston, 1843.

altogether without rebuke, "He was not accused while at Plymouth, or at Salem, of any deviation from the established principles of the churches on points of faith, much less was there any impeachment of his moral character."* He who was "His Eminence," beyond any titled cardinal, (Master Cotton,) thoroughly disrelished him, as we can with infinite ease imagine. Cotton denounced him, (O remember it, ye anti-monarchical American annals!) as guilty of lese-majesty; that terrible crime against the emperors of Rome. Cotton instigated the magistrates, in whose bosoms pity lingered; and the fate of Williams was inevitable. Nay, more, the tyrannical edict which exiled him was vindicated, and doubtless by Cotton's Nov-Anglo-Jesuitical logic, "not as a punishment for opinion, or as a restraint on freedom of conscience."† [112]

His departure from Salem "in secrecy and haste" in the dead of winter; his private letter that Winthrop ventured at his own peril to address him; his temporary sojourn at Seekonk; his warning from the governor of Plymouth to remove to a greater distsnce; his voyage in a canoe; his not knowing "what bread or bed did mean;" his entertainment by savages less harsh than his Christian brethren; the solitary piece of gold which a "great and pious soul" put into the hands of his poor wife—his wants, his perils, his sufferings, his perseverance, and his patience; his steady piety, and freedom from the revenge of angry and abusive murmurs, though his sentence of banishment *never* was revoked; his paying Massachusetts good for evil, by defending her against the Indians,‡ though Massachusetts repaid him evil

[112] See Note 112.

---

* "His opinions were his only crimes."—Sparks' Am. Biog. 2d ser iv. 55—Yet we are assured the Puritans never persecuted opinions!

† Bancroft, i. pp. 374, 377.

‡ See Verplanck's Discourses, pp. 28, 29, and his authorities. Also Mass. Hist, Coll. 2d ser. ix. 177.

for good—hardly granting him a bare passage through her territory, on his way home from England—refusing passports to *his* people, which she granted to every body else—refusing to *sell* him powder for the defence of his life, in a "most bloody and massacring time," though she could *buy* powder herself, and not pay for it "for divers years"*—these numerous and diversified particulars form, all together, such a striking, and, as the term goes, *romantic* assemblage, as might "point" more "morals," and "adorn" more "tales," than a thousand and one wild fictions. But I cannot dwell upon them, further than to refer to the authorities already mentioned—to his long pathetic letter in the first volume of the first series of the Mass. Hist. Collections,† and to quote the following verses, descriptive of his condition at Providence, from Hopkins' History of that ancient town.‡ Little as any fastidious reader may commend their poetry, it must be a dull heart which cannot be awakened by them to salutary sympathies. The verses were written in 1765.

Nor house, nor hut, or fruitful field,
  Nor lowing herd, nor bleating flock,
Or garden that might comfort yield,
  No cheerful early-crowing cock.
No orchard yielding pleasant fruit,
  Or laboring ox, or useful plough,
Nor neighing steed, or browsing goat,
  Or grunting swine, or foodful cow.
No friend to help, no neighbor nigh,
  Nor healing medicine to restore;
No mother's hand to close the eye,
  Alone, forlorn, and most extremely poor.

Puritanism has complained, most sorely, of the *rocks of collision* § which it was destined to encounter on English

* Hutchinson's Collec. pp. 277, 8.—Benedict's Baptists, i. 466.—Felt's Salem, p. 89.—Savage's Winthrop. ii. 211.

† Also Knowles's R. Williams, p. 393, &c.

‡ See Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. ix. 171.

§ Cowper's Odyssey, xii. 72.

territory. Against many a rock as terrible, did it dash offenders upon its own. Such were some of the penalties to which, in the day of its power, it doomed an "apostle of intellectual liberty." And such, then, under its most unfriendly auspices, was the formal, and, one might almost say, tragic beginning of the denomination of Baptists in our country.

Roger Williams is the *apex rerum*, to whom they look up with filial veneration. True, Williams was not like John Smith of Amsterdam, a Se-Baptist; that is, a baptizer of his own self.* He was immersed by Mr. Ezekiel Holliman, an unbaptized layman according to Baptist theory, and "a mean fellow," according to *Puritan* annals;† whereupon he took upon himself the prerogative of immersing Holliman, and some ten besides. This, as Mr. Knowles informs us, was the foundation of "the first Baptist church in America, and the second, as it is stated, in the British empire."‡ However, in after life, though he had some rough words with the Quakers,§ Mr. Williams seems to have grown almost a Quaker himself, in his notions of sacramental ceremonies; for he would not celebrate the Communion, nor unite in it when celebrated by his brethren.|| [113]

Still, notwithstanding his equivocal beginning¶ and his stray conclusion, the Baptists look up to him, as, in this country, their "Father of the Faithful"; and trace in him, and through him, the origin, rise, and permanent establish-

[113] See Note 113.

---

* Davis's Morton, 151. Note.

† See Hubbard's New England, p. 338.

‡ Knowles's Memoir, pp. 165, 166.

§ Savage's Winthrop, i. 41, 42. Note. || Knowles, p. 388.

¶ Equivocal, even on the theory of lay-baptism. For how could Mr. Holliman, who, according to Baptist notions, was not baptized himself, administer baptism to another in the same predicament? Baptism, even if laymen may administer it, must be performed by some one who has received it himself.

ment of their persuasion, to oppressing, persecuting, and banishing Puritans.

Now as all familiar with the ecclesiastical history of New England are bound to be aware of this, I would fain ask Mr. Choules, (not yet having had an opportunity to examine, in detail, his edition of Neal,) whether he has added a new chapter to his author by adoption, so as to illustrate this crowning fact in the history of his own denomination? And to this question, I would most respectfully add another to Mr. Knowles,* viz., How a man so sensible and independent as his bearing marks him, can speak so openly of Williams' manifold sufferings, and then (for thus it looks,) shrinking from the decree of reprobation assigned all plain questioners of Puritan sanctity, soften and varnish Puritan harshness, under the plea that it was the result of undoubted *sincerity ?*†

If Puritanism can enjoy the privilege of having Baptist editors, and Baptist extenuators, because of its genuine sincerity, I must be permitted to hope, that the same privilege will ere long be extended to Ap. Laud. I am quite sure, that a perusal of the history of Endicott's administration‡ would prepare such gentlemen to find very many fewer *loca vexata*, to be unravelled in the life of the Archbishop, than now they are inclined to imagine. Nay, if they will add to sympathy with their own brethren, during that "reign of terror," a sympathy with their fellow-sufferers the Quakers, I should almost be afraid, that when they afterwards came to

* I did not know, when this was written, that Prof. Knowles was dead.

† Gammell, p. 55, seems inclined to make the same mistake.—The Hon. Mr. Gray also; who would, I fear, deny the same excuse to Ap. Laud, *cum totis viribus.* See Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d Series, viii. 198.

‡ "The New England churches," says Daniel Neal himself, "would neither suffer the Baptists to live quietly in their communion, nor separate peaceably from it."—New England, i. 285.

Laud's bloody passage to his grave, their eyes might moisten with a tear, and their hearts allow, that through the gate of death he had gone to a joyful resurrection. For surely, if there be any virtue in this plea of sincerity, it forms all the apology the history of the Archbishop can ever want; since even Mr. Bancroft admits his honesty, as has been observed before,[114] and Neal, (be it remembered to his honor!) that he was no Papist.* Beyond a doubt, as Messrs. Grant and Short effectually demonstrate, the former in particular, blunt, strait-forward honesty was a prominent characteristic of this martyr to the sanguinary rage of his Puritan enemies.† It was his impatience of quirks and trickery, evasion and double dealing, Jesuitry, in fine, of all sorts, whether Popish or Protestant, which made him utter such sharp and hasty language, in the presence of his reviler, Shepard, (a reviler like the Mathers in a religious diary,) and threw the warm blood of an open heart into his face. It was not "extreme malice and secret venom," which made his countenance flush so ruddily. He *charged* Shepard, as Shepard's own confession shows, "to deal plainly with him"; and complained bitterly of the cheats and equivocations which had been palmed off upon him.‡ The recollection of these made him blush, perhaps, for shame, and grow red with indignation. Cold-blooded malice, and venom nursed in a malignant heart, would have made him turn pale; or try to lure a victim within its toils by slow and infernal arts. I honor Laud all the more for his quickness, his demand of honesty, and his warmth glowing from his very features.

[114] See Note 114.

---

* Grant's Eng. Ch. ii. 230. Note.

† Grant's Eng. Ch. ii. 229–234 .Short's Hist. ii. 129–135.

‡ Sewel gives us a specimen. They would have "tobacco-pipes, bread and cheese, and cold meat," on a table at their meetings; and if the officers came in upon them, would fall to smoking and eating with all their might.—Sewel's Quakers, p. 473.

But who would not think it a well nigh desperate business, to demand allowance for Laud's firm devotion to what he *sincerely* "believed a solemn duty to God," viz., "to employ force if necessary for the suppression of false doctrines"? Who would not call it folly, to ask for a charitable construction of his conduct in this "suppression," because he thought, as with the Puritan he most *sincerely* did, "that he who permitted error to be believed and preached, was chargeable with a participation in the guilt?"* And yet, says Mr. Knowles of the banishment of Roger Williams, "We ought to rejoice that we can ascribe it to a *sincere*, though misdirected desire, to uphold the Church and advance the honor of God. Were these excellent men now alive, they would be foremost in lamenting their own error."† And do you verily believe so, my good Baptist neighbor? Then read the address of the Hon. Mr. Adams, before the celebrated Historical Society of Massachusetts, at so late a date as A. D. 1843; and I will pause for your reply.

Ah, this argument about *sincerity* is a two-edged sword: it must be handled warily. Sincerity! Cromwell boasted of it, and the Autocrat of all the Russias glories in it. Glad enough would Prince Metternich be to find it an excuse for anti-republican transgressions: he could then forge, most honorably, a fresh "Holy Alliance," which would dismember the United States by a rule well known in Poland. Sincerity! it is the first of all hobbies to the usurper, the despot,‡ the radical, the infidel, the atheist. Abner Kneeland, in his infamous paper, avowed the firm determination of many on Puritan soil, (!!) not to bow,

* Compare Knowles, p. 76, for the quoted words.

† Knowles, p. 80.

‡ Cardinal Richelieu died with "a solemn protestation, appealing to the last Judge of man, who was about to pronounce his sentence, that he never proposed any thing but for the good of religion and the state."—D'Israeli's Curios. of Lit. iii. 334. Boston, 1833.

never to bow the knee, to a spiritual Divinity.* Admit the sanction of sincerity, and you are an *editor* of his blasphemous resolve to—as far as in him lay—annihilate the worship of a God. Admit it, and what ampler apology would the Governor of Plymouth need for his "extreme malice and secret venom," who, says Sewel, "did not stick to say, that in *his conscience*, the Quakers were such a people that deserved to be destroyed, they, their wives and children, their houses and lands, without pity or mercy."† Admit it, and Muretus, who eulogized the massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1572, will have something worthier than a brazen front to fortify him. Charles IX. need not then have "perished in agony and horror," nor Catherine de Medici, *patriae communis Erinnys*, "died full of years and iniquities, unhonored and unmourned."‡

There probably never were *sincerer* devotees, than the professors of two apparently most opposite creeds; one of whom brought Servetus § to the stake, and the other daggered Henry IV. of France.

And then, after all, what makes Mr. Knowles' plea the more mal-apropos, it is as stale as it is unserviceable. It is the very plea of the Puritans themselves, which South ridiculed nearly two hundred years ago; and he never would have ridiculed that which his hearers did not know as familiarly as he himself did. I may be pardoned, therefore, for quoting South, and bringing this part of my subject to a close. "But still conscience, conscience, is pleaded as a covering for all enormities, an answer to all questions and accusations. Ask them what made them fight against, imprison, and murder

* See S. D. Parker's argument at Kneeland's trial in Boston. It is valuable both for its reasoning and its authorities. Mr. P. is a son of the late Bishop Parker.

† Hist. Quakers, p. 224. ‡ British Critic, xvii. 73.

§ It is amusing to see Mr. Benedict claiming this heretic as a Baptist; and also finding plenty of Baptists among the Socinians of Poland!—History, i. 179, 180, 186.

their lawful sovereign? Why, conscience. What made them extirpate the government, and pocket the revenue of the Church? Conscience. What made them perjure themselves with contrary oaths? what makes swearing a sin, and forswearing to be none? what made them lay hold on God's promises and break their own? Conscience. What made them sequester, persecute, and undo their brethren, rape their estates, ruin their families, get into their places, and then say they only robbed the Egyptians? Why, still, this large capacious thing, *their conscience.*"* And to carry out the queries, with reference to New England and the Baptists, upon the authority of Mr. Benedict—What made them fasten their eyes so eagerly upon "the goods of dissenters," and so inflexibly rigorous "in enforcing their taxing laws," that they could demand *eightpence* from a poor female, for the support of a minister whose doctrine she did not acknowledge, and let her languish in prison "almost a year" because she refused payment?† And I suppose the answer must be, as ready and as effectual as ever, "Conscience."

Messrs. Choules and Knowles, I commend this answer to your choicest meditations. "Were these excellent men now alive, they would be foremost" in resorting to your patronage, in vindication of their persecutions of your own ecclesiastical forefathers, and would take shelter behind your names as the *ægis* of their protection.‡

* South's Sermons, Oxford, 1823, iii. 439.

† Benedict's Baptists, i. 269, 270.

‡ In these remarks about sincerity, I am by no means aiming at Messrs. C. and K. personally, but at the Puritan doctrine concerning *the sufficiency of sincerity.* This is an old notion, and was rebuked, not by South only, but others; e. g. by W. Parker, in his examination of the Confession of the Westminster Assembly, which he published in 1651. Thus, on p. 195, Parker says, "Whereas you imply, 'That bare sincerity will carry out the Saints, though they remain imperfect in their obedience, all their life long;' it is a great mistake, for the Lord requires growth answerable unto the grace, means, and space offered unto men,

I will close this letter with an important historical correction, which, as it can be made more easily by a reference to Baptist authorities than any others, may as well be inserted here as any where.

Mr. Robert Walsh, Jr., in his "Appeal from the judgments of Great Britain," is so over-anxious to make out a strong case for his countrymen, on *every count* of the indictment, that he suffers the treatment of his Popish brethren by the Puritans to escape with "few stripes," and says expressly: "The religious ferment subsided in New England before the expiration of the seventeenth century. Not an instance is to be found, in her subsequent history, of sanguinary or vexatious persecution for variations in opinion or worship."*

Now Mr. Brougham, the present Lord Brougham, had said in his "Colonial Policy," as quoted by Mr. Walsh, that "long after the mother country had relinquished *forever* the acts of persecution, they found votaries in the constituted authorities of the Colonies, and the *Northern States*, at the end of the seventeenth century, afforded the disgraceful example of that spiritual tyranny, from which their territories had originally served as an asylum." This Mr. W. endeavors indignantly to rebut; with how much success, the historian of the Baptists can answer more expressively, perhaps, than any other person, though Churchmen, Quakers, &c., might all have something to contribute towards the emphasis of his reply.

even of them who are sincere already."—This authority will satisfy all who think Dr. South may be prejudiced about the matter.

And, now, I will but add, that the intelligent theologian will perceive, in a moment, the school from which such a doctrine as *the sufficiency of sincerity* has come. It is the Romish Church which teaches, that devotion to the true faith, and enmity to heresy, make up for many obliquities of life. So devotion to Puritanism coudl compound for many a failure in other respects.

* Part I. p. 51.—It will be seen, by and by, that in Massachusetts, in 1700, a law with the penalty of death was passed against Romish priests.

Mr. Walsh's position is, that New England never saw even a "vexatious persecution" after A. D. 1700. "Many," says Mr. Benedict, "were the oppressions and privations which our brethren suffered in this boasted asylum of liberty, *until the American war.*"* It is a fact that I can find no act "to exempt persons commonly called Anabaptists within this province, (Massachusetts) from being taxed for and toward the support of [Puritan] ministers," till the year 1728. And then it is found among the "Temporary acts," and special care is taken to let it last but a few years,† even at that late day.‡ True, the act was revived, but always with a proviso making it temporary, and showing that the Puritans never would, and never did give their confidence to the Baptists, to the latest moment of their colonial existence.

And how was it afterwards, when full liberty had blessed themselves, and when they might be supposed well inclined to bestow it on others, without any bitter mixture? "The Baptists, with Mr. Backus at their head, preferred a petition to the Legislature, praying 'That ministers should, *in future* [Mr. B.'s own italics] be supported by Christ's au-

* Benedict's Baptists, i. 381.—In 1722, the citizens of Providence, R. I., replied thus to the Puritan ministers of Massachusetts, who had tried to wheedle them into an amnesty. "At this very present, you are rending towns in pieces, ruining the people with innumerable charges, which make them decline your ministry, and *fly for refuge to the Church of England,* and others to dissenters of all denominations, while you like wolves pursue; and whenever you find them within your reach, you seize upon their estates."—Quoted in Benedict's Baptists, i. 470.

Here is most important testimony, from those *out* of Massachusetts, that in the early part of the last century, the Church of England was a city of refuge to those who fled from Puritan oppressions *within* the Bay State.

† Seven, perhaps, like the act of 1740. Mr. Felt in his Salem, p. 386, does not say; and I have not the "Temporary Acts" up to 1728.

‡ Temporary Acts, folio, Boston, 1742, pp. 21, 248; and for the year 1757. See Benedict, i. 443, 444. Imprisonments, &c., happened notwithstanding.

thority, and not at all by assessment and secular force.' And had statesmen been let alone in their discussions, it is highly probable that this petition would have been regarded; but the clergy, poor men," (who can help thinking of the days of Master Cotton?) "were afraid to be left on this precarious ground; they therefore put forth their cries, legislators heard them, pitied their dangerous condition, and disgraced the State Constitution with an article to regulate religious worship, and so on."*

And no wonder; for the antipathies of Massachusetts were as iron-bound as its coasts. They never relaxed.† Roger Williams never was forgiven;‡ the colony of Rhode Island, though it would gladly have joined the old Confederacy, was excluded by Massachusetts, as Dr. Morse intelligently says, "for particular reasons;"§ and for like "particular reasons," the Baptists were harassed, in one way or another, till 1834, when the walls of partition were at last laid low, and the soil of Massachusetts, after two centuries of hampering, was made as religiously free as the banished Williams desired to make it in the year 1635.||

One word as to the correctness of Mr. Brougham, on other authorities than my own, and this letter shall end. Mr. Charles Purdon Cooper, in his speech for the Unitarians, in the case respecting Lady Hewley's foundations, tells us that the last victims of the act *de heretico comburendo*, suffered in 1611.¶ One of them, Edward Wightman, *the last of English sufferers at the stake*, Mr. Benedict insists on claiming as a Baptist; though he admits that he was accused of almost every "heretical *ism*, that ever infected the

* Benedict's Baptists, i. 381.

† Gough gives instances of violent Quaker persecution, requiring royal interference, in 1705 and 1724.—Gough's Quakers, iv. 56, 219.

‡ Knowles's Williams, p. 79. § Geog. 1792, p. 158.

|| There was partial relief for Baptists, &c., in 1811.—Benedict, i. 449.

¶ Speech, 2d edit. p. 35.

Christian world," and Fuller declares that *ten* were named in his indictment.* But be this as it may, it was about half a century after this, that the *last* victims of Puritanism suffered death; (much more, if we go into the history of witchcraft, which I am willing to pass by:†) and its sanguinary executions were finally suspended, only through fear of Mr. Greenwood's "profligate tyrant," the second Charles. Tyre and Sidon had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes; but the children of the covenant still held to the doctrine of coercive power "as the matter shall require."

Says Mr. Bozman, in his esteemed history of Maryland, (p. 197,) and after instancing some of the severities of the English government, "But it will surprise the reader, at this day, after reading these severe denunciations against the Puritans, unjustifiable indeed upon any other principle than self-preservation, and after a minute search through the pages of the best historians of those times, when he finds considerable difficulty in discovering ONE SOLITARY INSTANCE where a Puritan was either burnt as a heretic, or hung as a felon for his religion."‡ Alonzo Lewis, in his laborious history of Lynn, has in one short and quiet sentence well expressed the nature of the persecutions, suffered by Puritan ministers from the Church of England. They were not permitted, he says, to perform her services.§ That is, they would have performed services for her, in *their* way. She chose another, and her own, and excluded them: and

* Benedict's Baptists, i. 196. Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 255.

† I beg that this may be noted. Walsh, in his Appeal, p. 52, concedes the story of the witches, as the *worst* part of New England history. But I let it all go. Surely if I were actuated by an aggressive spirit, I would not do so.

‡ Gough, in his Quakers, i. 374, note, says that "England did not banish or hang any of their preachers." He could not say as much for New England towards his own sect.

§ Lewis's Lynn, p. 54.

this was persecution! It was, however, as its own character obviously implies, an act of self-preservation: a principle, which, as Mr. Bancroft intimates, can justify severity. That the principle of self-preservation was the one which animated and can sanction the "excesses," as he styles them, of the Puritans, is the argument of Mr. Bancroft. "The people," is his claim, "did not attempt to convert others, but to protect themselves."* That the same principle pervaded the Church of England, and can be its apology with no less effect, is what I affirm with the most solid confidence; and with due thanks to Mr. B., for an argument which resembles some of his brother politicians, and is, in their favorite phrase, AVAILABLE.

LETTER XV.

My last letter was devoted to the relations between Puritans and the Baptists, and was designed to show that their exclusiveness was inflicted upon them, as effectually as upon Churchmen, or even more so. The same design will be pursued in this, with a simple change of subject. I would now introduce my readers to the bearings of Puritanism towards those, whom almost every body calls Quakers; though an author I shall have frequent occasion to quote calls this a "nickname," "which the Independents [that is Congregationalists] had *first* given to the professors of the light."†

I shall of course, limited by my plan, be unable to give a full picture of some scenes in Quaker history, which ought to be known to multitudes, who are utterly unacquainted with them; and which can be appreciated by at least one

* Bancroft, i. 463. † Sewel's History, p. 99.

well-drawn example, as they could not be by bare references, however elaborate. My *first* object, accordingly, will be to present a condensed statement of the sufferings of this outraged sect, under the discipline of those, who are supposed to have made the most celebrated missionary expedition in all history, for the enjoyment and promotion of religious freedom. "It is the best people—the most pious and exemplary *always*," says a Puritan author, "and commonly not the least intelligent and respectable, that persecution banishes from its communion, while it retains the worst."* Under the ban of this high authority, the Baptists, whose case has been considered already, might take comfortable shelter, when they survey New England in the light of the past. To the Quakers, it must be a precious boon; for it will prove them, ere this letter is done, to have been the *elite* of early New England society.

After giving the promised statement, I shall then rely principally for what remains, upon the Quaker historian Sewel, and let him speak very much for himself. The edition of Sewel's book I shall make use of, is the folio one printed at London in 1722; which is said upon its title-page to have been written, at first, in Low Dutch, and translated into English by the author. This, of course, has all the authenticity of a work written directly in English, and is said, by the Biographie Universelle,† to be esteemed for its exactitude and fidelity. How far this book is known in this country, I am unable to say. I believe, though I am not certain, that an edition or an abridgment of it has been published; but to most persons, not belonging to the Quaker Society, I suppose it to be a novelty, and may therefore quote it more extensively than would otherwise be proper.

To proceed now with the statement which was my first object, I may say that I have been at some pains to gather

* Mitchell's Ch. Member, p. 16. † Tom. xlii. 193, 194.

and arrange, from the writings of Hutchinson, from the ancient Colony Laws of both Massachusetts and Plymouth, from Hazard's Collection of Papers, and from other sources, the various *titles* bestowed by the Puritans on the Quakers, and the sundry *characteristics* ascribed to their opinions, habits, and sectarism. The conclusion to which this labor has brought me is, that while the Puritans were never much addicted to what Jeremy Taylor calls "cool and tame homilies"* upon those who differed from them, the poor Quakers received a Benjamin's mess of such scourges, as can be applied by a member proverbially unruly. The titles and characteristics in question shall be exhibited, with pretty thorough proof that Puritan appellatives were never empty air, but were sustained and accredited in such a particular and emphatic manner as to prove them *sincere*, to the fullest measure of Professor Knowles's charity.

To begin. The *opinions* of the Quakers were pronounced "dangerous," "horrid," "hateful," "blasphemous," "devilish," "diabolical," and "damnable"—nay, "a stinking vapor from hell." As to their *practices*, they were condemned as "absurd and destructive;" and for their adherence to them they were proscribed as "impetuous attempters," "arrogant and bold intruders," "proselyters," "open seducers," "evil speakers of dignities," "revilers of magistrates and ministers," "despisers and overthrowers of *the order of God* † in Church and Commonwealth," "open and capital blasphemers." When spoken of collectively *as a sect*, the Quakers were called, and even in the most solemn and deliberate publications of the Government, (of the publications of the Pulpit a reader can easily guess from such specimens,) "ranters,"

* Pref. Lib. of Prophesying.

† The Puritans believed, it seems, in the Divine right of *their own* church order, and civil government also. With what grace could they complain of the most ultra Tory, who believed in the Divine right of *his* Church and State? *Turpe est doctori, cum culpa redarguit ipsum.*

"rogues and vagabonds," "pernicious, blasphemous, cursed heretics." The repetition of the word "cursed" is perfectly frightful. "Cursed Quakers" seems to have been almost or quite a set phrase, or a statutory formula, like the execrations of the council of Trent. As to the *treatment* of these unfortúnate people, a Puritan bark was never worse than a Puritan bite. Endicott and his satellites were not the men to say, without meaning, "Take heed ye break not our ecclesiastical laws, for then ye are sure to stretch by a halter."* This was said, to be sure, before there was actual law to sustain it. But it was said by one who had what a statesman called the "prophetic eye of taste;" who knew what his people would bear, nay choose, and who spoke therefore as *pythily* as a priestess of Apollo. He saw the end from the beginning, and he gave the first Quakers who defiled Puritan soil, a surety which was redeemed to the letter. Massachusetts became a perfect Quaker Purgatory. It was warm enough at the outset; but finally resembled Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, in being "one seven times hotter," till, save for royal interposition, i might have proceeded to untold excesses, and with the insatiate wrath of Romanism against Wickliff,† burned a dead Quaker's bones. When the Quakers were first rumored of, they proclaimed a fast;‡ but when that would not do, they followed the example of Juno; *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.*§

But to come to actual, rather than possible, facts. The Quakers were compelled to attend on the services of the Puritan preachers; and when they assembled by themselves, though never so privately, their doors might be broken open: a thing, which, as was before remarked, Lord Chatham did not hesitate to say, in the face of all Parliament, the King could not do and dare not. This,

* Sewel, p. 160. And compare Gough, i. 369.

† L'Enfant's Conc. Const. i. 216.

‡ See Felt's Salem, pp. 192, 193.

§ Aneid vii. 312.

however, was lawful in New England, when any one set up—as Mr. Adams tells us Roger Williams did—a conventicle! A conventicle on *Puritan* soil—Oh Milton, with all the machinery of the Paradise Lost, could you have described the phenomenon! But I shall be more lost myself in considering it, if I pause here, than a stranger would be in contemplating Westminster Abbey—so let me hasten away. The Quakers could be apprehended without warrant, tried without jury, fined without mercy, incarcerated without bail at the pleasure of their tormentors, and "be kept at work and not suffered to speak."* They could be put in stocks and in *cages*, and exposed to scorn, hooting, and filthy missiles: this last punishment being one of those ingenious cruelties in which I never knew Puritans equalled, but by such monstrous oppressors of human rights, and fiendlike sporters with human comfort as Tamerlane, and Louis XI. of France. Their disposal of property was rendered null, because they could not conscientiously verify by oath a last will and testament, nor have their own signatures proved by the oaths of others.† They could, for pertinacity in the maintenance of their sentiments, and continued dishonor to Puritan worship by absence from it, be stripped naked to the waist, (women as well as men,)‡ and be stretched, rack-wise, upon the wheels of a great gun; or tied to a cart's tail, be dragged through a town's most public streets, and from town to town, till marched out of the Commonwealth, and be "severely

* Felt's Salem, p. 193. The Puritans were very systematic. Neal says the Quakers were to be whipped *twice a week*, until they went to work. The first time five stripes to be put on additional, and each time after, three more.—New England i. 303.

† Felt's Salem, p. 237.

‡ Children, also, for a parent's sake.—Sewel, p. 338. Patience Scott, only *eleven* years of age, is put in prison; and her mother whipped ten lashes, for yearning with maternal compassion over her hapless child. —Hutch. Hist. i. pp. 183, 184.

whipped," or, as one of them expressed it, "slashed"* as they went along. Gough (ii. 36, 37,) has preserved an actual warrant, directing three *women* to be whipped through *eleven* towns; which would have been a distance of eighty miles! And this warrant, too, was subsequent to the mandamus of King Charles, and when, as an *act of mercy*, they had restricted the punishment of being whipped from town to town, to the number of *three towns*, *i. e.*, they would drive their wretched fellow-creatures through three towns and not eleven, and for twenty miles, perhaps, instead of eighty! And this was progressive charity! But I shall forget my climax in this awful schedule. They could be turned out at dead of night amid frost and snow; or driven into a howling wilderness "among wolves and bears." They could be branded R. (rogue) and H. (heretic;)† their ears could be cropped, and their tongues bored through, or "thorow,"‡ as the old statute expressed it. They could be sold as slaves.§ They could be banished, and finally hung and left unburied, for noisome birds or ravenous beasts.

And to all this the Puritans could be provoked, by the ministers of their religion—by, for example, one who for piety and learning might be supposed the foremost, the President of Harvard University. "Suppose," said Charles Chauncy in a sermon, when they had *six* Quakers in prison, and were deliberating on their fate, "Suppose ye should catch *six* wolves in a trap, and ye cannot prove that they killed either sheep or lambs; and now you have them they will neither bark nor bite, yet they have the plain mark of wolves. Now I leave it to your consideration, whether you will let them go alive, yea or nay."|| Such logic from the *pulpit* was

* Gough, ii. 41. † Sewel, p. 224. Anc. Col. Laws, p. 125.

‡ See note 98, for the word "thorow."

§ Neal records this frightful fact.—N. Eng. i. 303, 304.

|| Gough's History, i. 365. The punning on *yea* or *nay* is shocking. President Chauncey's manuscripts were used up by a pie-maker, to keep

the major of a syllogism, of which the *minor* proposition was the magistrate, and the *conclusion* the gallows.* And that conclusion was so agreeable, that they did not soon grow weary of it. No, when some of the Quakers declared that they were willing to die for their opinions, what was Endicott's brutal answer? "We shall be as ready to take away your lives, as you shall be to lay them down." And what the exclamation of one of his myrmidons, when the Quakers had been harassed for years, and as many of them destroyed as could be, while a fresh arrest presented a prospect of renewed severity? He declared it "his delight, and he could rejoice in following the Quakers to execution as much as ever."†

In view of a law which sanctioned such unquenchable thirst for heretical blood, well can one say with old Sewel, when he had just been reciting it, "Here endeth this sanguinary act, being more like to the decrees of the Spanish Inquisition, than to the laws of a reformed Christian magistracy; consisting of such who themselves, to shun persecution, (which was but a small fine for not frequenting the public worship,) had left old England."‡ Or, with Gough, whose language answers even more effectually the purposes of Churchmen, "Is not this law an apology for Laud and his associates, in asserting a right to punish men for denying established forms; particularly as they stopped short of the extremities to which these precise barbarians proceeded; they neither banished nor hanged any of their preachers, the hardships they had chiefly to complain of be-

his pies from scorching. Perhaps they rendered less fuel necessary. Allen's Biog. Dict. p. 250, a.

* Well, and if it does, the President is blameless; for as Master Cotton says, if you do counsel magistrates to persecute, it does not argue that you are responsible for their acts.

† Gough, i. 369, and ii. 39. Compare Sewel, p. 279.

‡ Sewel, p. 200. Hewatt's S. Carolina, i. 34.

ing a deprivation of their ecclesiastical emoluments, which the Quakers wanted not from them?"*

This allusion of Sewel to the Inquisition reminds me of the romantic excursion undertaken by some females of his sect, who went to Malta, and holding forth too freely were imprisoned for a long time in the cells of the "Holy Office." There they were pestered by the monks, equally enthusiastic with themselves, and who, according to Leslie, have the same parentage.† One of these monks offered to have a finger cut off, if they would turn good "Catholics;" while others, wearied with their inflexibility, gave them some most ungallant scoldings. Still they found plenty of time, in such apparently close quarters, to darn stockings and mend old clothes. They were finally released in a very courteous manner.‡

With this passage of Quaker romance, I am constrained to join a second well-attested one, concerning another of their heroines. This dauntless Amazon, after having dared to confront the sour visage of Puritanism in the clime of New England, grew bold enough to figure among "precise barbarians" of a somewhat different, though not more exclusive school. She even ventured among the Turks, and aspired to the honor of converting the grand Soldan himself. This was Mahomet IV., and he happened, at the moment of her arrival upon Turkish territory, to be in a place not the most propitious for a lady, under any cir-

* Gough, i. 374, note.

† Leslie's Works, fol., ii. 94, 560, 561, 613, or iv. 190; vi. 192, new edit.—Barwick on the Ch. p. xx.—Leslie shows, very satisfactorily, how Quakerism and many other *isms* have been started by the Jesuits, to aid the cause of Popery by increasing divisions among Protestants. Douglass in his Summary says, truly enough, there is as much superstition in a broad-brimmed hat, &c., as in "pontifical accoutrements."—Vol. i. 442, note.

‡ Sewel, pp. 293–312. Gough, ii. 51, etc.

cumstances—viz. an army's camp. Nevertheless, how mistaken soever her views, after the example of an eminent saint who counted not his life dear unto himself, "She went alone to the camp, and got somebody to go to the tent of the Grand Vizier to tell him that an English woman was come, who had something to declare from the great God to the Sultan." And, chimerical as it may seem, she obtained the audience she wished. His majesty of the Sublime Porte was any thing but offended. "She was brought before the Sultan, who had his great men about him, in such a manner as he was used to admit ambassadors." And the successor of the Arabian prophet said he could not but respect a philanthropist, who would come so far on such a profoundly kind errand; and "hearkened to her with much attention and gravity." Nor so only, but when "she asked him 'Whether he understood what she said?' he answered 'Yes, every word;' and farther said 'that what she had said was truth.'" And then, (no doubt like the Indian, who when he formally admitted the stories of his missionary, expected the same courtesy for his own,) he set his courtiers to asking questions, and was not a little curious to know if her ladyship would not pay a compliment or two to Mahomet in return. Sewel may well say "she answered warily;" for having breathed a Massachusetts atmosphere, she made what a New Englander would call such a "cute"* reply, that the gentlemen of the long beard were quite smitten, allowed her to depart without the least "hurt or scoff," and even offered her the protection of a guard; which she politely declined, and reached Constantinople in perfect safety.† Nay, it is not impossible that her name is still fragrant there; for so remarkable an incident was not likely to be neglected, and

* See N. Bailey's Dictionarium Britannicum, Folio of 1730. Bailey derives it from the Latin, *acutus*.

† Sewel, pp. 257, 258. Gough, i. 418.

who can tell but that it led to that history of America, which was published awhile after in the Turkish language!*

Such was the treatment of Quakers, (not in any better era than the Quakers lived in,) from a tribunal of which it has been supposed earth never saw its match in horrors of cruelty, and from the disciples of one, who might most fitly be styled a prophet of fire and the sword. When I contrast it with their treatment, standing out in such bold relief from the rugged and bloody history of New England, I am compelled to say, O my powers of comparison, how utterly are ye put at fault by nominal Christians, professed exiles from persecution, and detesters of its wrongs, claimants of a purer name and principles than the whole world else, to whom the *Inquisition* and the *Turk* may be examples of moderation!† I wonder not that honest Sewel should say, the heavens grew dark and the sun refused to shine upon your deeds.‡ I wonder not that he should put side by side with your conduct, that of the terrible deceiver, Cromwell; who said he had rather be rolled into his grave, and buried with infamy, than overthrow liberty of conscience—and yet suffered persecution to go on!§

It has long been fashionable, friend reader, for Puritans to be most bountiful in censure of all system-mongers but themselves, "the chosen emissaries of God," "favorites with heaven," and "blessed beyond all mankind, for they were the depositaries of the purest truth." Even Mr. Bancroft can discover this quality in their composition, any "mists" to the contrary notwithstanding; for the language just quoted is from one of his own descriptions.|| And especially hath it been their custom and their delight, to

* Rich's Bibliotheca Americana, vol. ii. 43.

† See Gough, i. 421, for a similar reflection: not seen however till I had written the above. So it appears to be no uncommon reflection, how severe soever Puritans may pronounce it.

‡ Sewel, p. 278. § Ibid. p. 283. || Bancroft, i. 348.

avish these censures upon a Church, partial to the surplice, and a sign of that Cross, which was an "offence" to imperfect Christians, but to mature ones a "glory." (Gal. v. 11, and vi. 14.) In view of Puritanism's ready, if not spontaneous anathemas and proscriptions—and we have seen how it could not name a Quaker, to the thousandth time, without the habitual "curse;" whereas the Pope would have cursed him roundly for *once*, and have done with him—how composedly it could fancy all its opponents leagued with and prompted by the powers of darkness, and accordingly blacken and blast them to the extent of their diabolical merits—I say, in view of its ready, if not spontaneous anathemas and proscriptions, may it not pertinently be cautioned to remember the warning of the Son of Sirach, that there be those, who, when they curse Satan, are but cursing their own souls. (Ecclus. xxi. 27.)

The warning comes, I admit, from the Apocrypha; but if the Apocrypha was good authority *for* a Puritan oath, it is also good authority *against* Puritan denunciation. And, moreover, the earlier and less rabid Puritans always treated the Apocrypha with courtesy. Even old Miles Coverdale, who would not wear the lawn, honored it in his translation of the Scriptures. "Nevertheless," says he in his preface to the Apocryphal Books, "I have not gathered them together to the intent that I would have them despised or little set by, or that I should think them false, for I am not able to prove it." I may be pardoned saying thus much on an incidental matter; since the use of the Apocrypha was, in a Puritan view, a crying sin of the Church of England, and of the sternly Calvinistic Dutch.*

I will here suspend further remarks of my own, and introduce some extracts from Sewel; which, if the doctrine of the rhetoricians about individuality of ideas be true, will

* Sylloge Confessionum p. 329. Constitution, &c. Dutch Church, N. York, 1815, p. 15.

produce a deeper impression than the most elaborate discursive observations. He had just been giving an account of the trial and condemnation of William Robinson, Marmaduke Stephenson, and Mary Dyar, the first Quaker martyrs to Puritanical rigor. On his 231st page, he opens the last act of the dismal tragedy.

"The day appointed to execute the bloody sentence was the 27th of October,* when in the afternoon, [after the LECTURE was ended probably, as was the case at the execution of William Leddra!] the condemned prisoners were led to the gallows by the Marshal, Michaelson, and Capt. James Oliver, with a band of about two hundred armed men, besides many horsemen, as if they were afraid that some of the people would have rescued the prisoners. And that no actors on the stage might be wanting, the priest, Wilson,† joined to the company; who, when the Court deliberated how to deal with the Quakers, said, 'Hang them, or else'—drawing his finger athwart his throat, as if he would have said, 'Dispatch them this way.' Now the march began, and a drummer going next before the condemned, the drums were beaten, especially when any of them attempted to speak. Glorious signs of heavenly joy and gladness were beheld in the countenances of these three persons, who walked hand in hand, Mary being the middlemost; which made the Marshal say to her, who was *pretty aged and stricken in years*, 'Are you not ashamed to walk thus hand in hand between two young men?' 'No,' replied she, 'this is to me an hour of the greatest joy I could enjoy in this world. No eye can see, no ear can hear, no tongue can utter, and no heart can understand, the sweet incomes or influence, and the refreshings of the Spirit of the Lord which now I feel.' Thus going along, W. Rob-

* A. D. 1659.

† John Wilson, who had figured at the ordination of Master Cotton. Wilson was now more than seventy years old!

inson said, 'This is your hour and the power of darkness.' But presently the drums were beaten; yet shortly after leaving off, Marmaduke Stephenson said, 'This is the day of your visitation, wherein the Lord hath visited you.' More he spoke, but could not be understood by reason of the drums being beaten again. Yet they went on with great cheerfulness, as going to an everlasting wedding-feast, and rejoicing that the Lord had counted them worthy to suffer death for his Name's sake. When they were come near the gallows, the priest said in a taunting way to W. Robinson, 'Shall such Jacks as you come in before authority with their hats on?' To which Robinson replied, 'Mind you, mind you, it is for the not putting off the hat we are put to death.'

"Now being come to the ladder, they took leave of each other with tender embraces, and then Robinson went cheerfully up the ladder, and being got up, said to the people, 'This is the day of your visitation, wherein the Lord hath visited you: this is the day the Lord is risen in his mighty power, to be avenged on all his adversaries.' He also signified, that 'he suffered not as an evil doer,' and desired the spectators 'to mind the light that was in them,' to wit, the light of Christ, of which he testified and was now going to seal it with his blood.' This so incensed the envious priest, that he said, 'Hold thy tongue, be silent, thou art going to die with a lie in thy mouth.' The rope being now about his neck, the executioner bound his hands and legs, and tied his neckcloth about his face. Which being done, Robinson said, 'Now ye are made manifest;' and the executioner being about turning him off, he said, 'I suffer for Christ in whom I live, and for whom I die.'

"He being turned off, Marmaduke Stephenson stepped up the ladder, and said, 'Be it known unto all this day, that we suffer not as evil doers, but for conscience' sake.' And when the hangman was about to turn him off, he said,

'This day shall we be at rest with the Lord.' And so he was turned off.

"And Mary Dyar seeing now her companions hanging dead before her, also stepped up the ladder. But after her coats were tied about her feet, the halter put about her neck, and her face covered with a handkerchief, WHICH THE PRIEST WILSON LENT THE HANGMAN, just as she was to be turned off a cry was heard, 'Stop! for she is reprieved.' Her feet then being loosed, they bade her come down. But she, whose mind was already as it were in heaven, stood still and said, 'She was there willing to suffer as her brethren did, *unless they would annul their wicked law.*' Little heed was given to what she said; but they pulled her down, and the Marshal and others taking her by the arms, carried her to prison again. That she thus was freed of the gallows *this time*, [she was hung eventually,] was at the intercession of her son; to whom it seems they could not *then* resolve to deny that favor."*

Sewel then records a spirited and brave rebuke of Mary Dyar, written the next day to the Great and General Court; and shows that the magistrates dreading censure for the inquisitorial execution of Robinson and Stephenson, sent her away to Rhode Island, then the asylum of many oppressed ones from the "enemies, persecutors, and slanderers," in which Puritan territory abounded.

There are so many salient angles, as an engineer would call them, in Puritan story, that I beg to be excused for saying that this allusion to Rhode Island brings to mind the effort of Massachusetts, to make that famous little State a "partaker in other men's sins" against the hapless Quakers. But it was without any success whatever. Roger Williams and William Coddington, (who had signed the letter from the Arbella, and adhered to its catholic temper,

* Hazard's Coll. ii. 566.

till Massachusetts was too hot for him,*) had remembered St. Paul's counsel to Timothy, just alluded to, better than the boastful Puritans; some of whom (like Master Cotton)† had made up their minds on every text of the Bible! These fathers of Rhode Island had worthy successors; and when a letter came from Boston instigating Quaker persecution, it received an answer which should have taught a little wisdom, if it did not provoke a little shame. After declaring that there was no Rhode Island law which could assist Massachusetts in her dilemma of sin and blood, this most wholesome answer goes on to say, "And we moreover find, that in those places where these people aforesaid are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely, and are only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come; and we are informed that they begin to loath this place, for that they are not opposed by the civil authority."‡ How Massachusetts profited by such sagacious hints, given in 1657, Sewel has already told us; and I must now call upon him to tell further, by resuming his narrative and comments concerning the terrible executions of 1659. On page 233, he thus proceeds.

"Whilst I now leave her at home, [Mary Dyar was a mother and came from Rhode Island to visit her children,]§ I am to say that one John Chamberlain, an inhabitant of Boston, having seen the execution of W. Robinson and M. Stephenson, was so reached by their pious speeches, that he received the doctrine of the truth, for which they died. But his visiting those in prison was so ill resented, that afterwards he was whipped several times, *severely;* as was also Edward Wharton, an inhabitant of Salem, who having said, 'That the guilt of Robinson's and Stephenson's blood was so great and heavy that he was not able to bear it,' was,

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. ix. 27. † Magnalia, i. 249.

‡ Hazard's Collection, ii. 553. Hutchinson's Hist. i. 454.

§ Sewel, p. 171.

for this his pretended sauciness, whipped with twenty lashes and fined twenty pounds!

"But before I quite leave the persons that were hanged, I must say, that being dead, their countenances still looked fresh, for the terror of death had not seized them. But being *cut down*, they were very barbarously used; none taking hold of their bodies, which so fell down on the ground, that thereby *the scull* of W. Robinson *was broken*. And even their shirts were ripped off with a knife, and their naked bodies cast into a hole, which was digged, *without any covering*.* And when some of their friends would have laid their bodies into coffins, it was *denied* them. NEITHER WOULD THEY SUFFER THE PLACE WHERE THE BODIES WERE CAST TO BE FENCED WITH PALES, LEST RAVENOUS BEASTS MIGHT PREY UPON THEM." "And priest Wilson," he adds a little below, "did not stick to make a ballad on the executed."†

Here we reach the climax, and here Sewel's unfaltering narrative of this Puritan AUTO DA FE closes. In view of its persistive terrors, I feel at liberty to add, that as I have noticed several points of consanguinity between Puritanism and Popery, my readers may here recognize another, in their posthumous malevolence towards the heretical dead. Popery will not give the dissenter from its supremacy, a spot to lay his bones in :‡ it can even disinter him, as it did Wickliff, and scatter his ashes upon running waters, as Moses did the dust of Israel's wretched idol. Puritanism cannot give a dissenter from its supremacy, such a covering as the blood-

* Puritanism stript its enemies clean. A Puritan jailer could take the beds and Bibles of imprisoned Quakers for his fees.—Sewel, p. 160.

† This is quite credible, for Mather abused their dying pangs in prose.—Neal's New England, i. 309, 310.

‡ Who can forget Dr. Young's sad plaint over his Narcissa, buried in France at dead of night, and by his own hands?—Night Thoughts, N. III.

thirsty Joab gave Absalom the traitor, (2 Sam. xviii. 17,) but leaves him for the prowling dog and the carrion crow.

Soon after the incidents above related, Sewel completes his detail of the catastrophe which befell Mary Dyar, in whom the frost of age had not yet chilled the glow of intrepidity for the cause of charity and freedom. She was carried to the Puritan Golgotha, with a band of soldiers and the drums beaten as before, to prevent sympathy with her speeches. She made a short speech, however, at the foot of the scaffold, declaring that she came to keep blood-guiltiness from them, and desiring them to repeal their unrighteous and unjust law of banishment on pain of death. "Then," writes Sewel, (p. 234,) "priest Wilson said, 'Mary Dyar, O repent, O repent, and be not so deluded, and carried away by the deceit of the devil.' To this, Mary Dyar answered, 'Nay, man, I am not now to repent.' And being asked by some, 'Whether she would have the Elders pray for her,' she said, 'I know never an Elder here.' Being further asked 'Whether she would have any of the people to pray for her,' she answered, 'She desired the prayers of all the people of God.' Thereupon, some scoffingly said, 'It may be she thinks there is none here.' She, looking about, said, 'I know BUT FEW HERE.' Then they spoke to her again, 'That one of the Elders might pray for her.' To which she replied, 'Nay, first a child, then a young man, then a strong man, before an elder in Christ Jesus.' After this she was charged with something of which it was not understood what it was, but she seemed to hear it, for she said, 'It's false, it's false—I never spoke those words.' Then one mentioned that she should have said, 'She had been in Paradise.' To which she answered, 'Yea, I have been in Paradise several days.' And more she spoke, of the eternal happiness into which she was now to enter. In this well-disposed condition she was turned off, and died a martyr of Christ; being twice led to death, which the first time she

expected with undaunted courage, and now suffered with Christian fortitude. Thus this honest, valiant woman finished her days; but so hardened were these persecutors, that one of the Court said scoffingly, 'She did hang as a flag for others to take example by;' and putting to death *for religion* did not yet cease, as will be related hereafter."

Now the worst revenge I have ascertained the Quakers ever took for this pitiless treatment was, to call the subsequent infatuation of the Puritans about witchcraft and its fatal consequences, a judicial punishment for their previous violence against themselves.* But the advocates of the Puritans, as if with the Romanists they would not allow death itself to conquer their antipathies, crucify the Quakers afresh, by defending the conduct of their forefathers, as prompted and justified by *political* considerations. Dr. Holmes was castigated for this special pleading by the Quarterly Review, so long ago as 1809; yet in 1829, when twenty years after he published a second edition of his Annals, he reiterated the very sentences which the Review justly condemned.† He thus proved himself a lineal descendant of those, whom Hooker had before his eyes, and whose pertinacity he found never flinched. "Nature worketh in us all," said he, willing to share the sin, if possibly it might melt them never so little, "in *us all*, a love to our own counsels: the contradiction of others is a fan to inflame that love. Our love set on fire to maintain that which once we have done, sharpeneth the wit to dispute, to argue, and by all means to reason for it."‡

Mr. Bancroft comes to the rescue in even stronger terms. "The people"—if he says people meaning to exclude the

* Wynne's America, i. 89.—In some of the Lambeth manuscripts obtained by Dr. Hawks, I find it stated, as a curious coincidence, that at this time the wheat of Massachusetts began to be generally blasted, and its pease to grow wormy.

† Quart. Rev. ii. 316, Am. edit. Holmes' Annals, i. 312, 2d edit.

‡ Polity, Pref. Sect. 2, or Hanbury's edit. i. 19.

ministers and the magistrates, I can understand him, however disingenuous the evasion—"The people did not attempt to convert others, but to protect themselves; they never punished opinion as such; they never attempted to torture or terrify men into orthodoxy." While Endicott, the Tiberius of Massachusetts, (licentiousness of course excepted,) has his every fault gilded by a phrase of classical plausibility, "benevolent though austere."* Mr. Bancroft is a scholar, so we may presume that by this phrase he means "splendid bile": in other words, a *literal* translation of the *splendida bilis* of the ancient Romans.†

But Mr. L. Bacon surpasses both his coadjutors. In his Plymouth Anniversary speech, he doubles behind a concession or two; but in his Historical Discourses, like a rat in a corner without a loophole, he turns a fierce front, sets his teeth, and declares: "Our ancestors made laws against the fanatics with whom they had to do, and boldly and manfully maintained those laws."‡ Alas! there is "a train of mists" hovering about such stout allegations, which makes their truth quite cloudy. If Messrs. Bancroft and Bacon can see through them, their eyes would sell for diamonds among the fishermen of our fog-banks.§

However, let me not overrule them, as they try to do others, by assertion only. I am very willing to argue the matter a little for the satisfaction of some; since writers like Gough and Douglass, to say nothing of Sewel,|| distinctly repudiate the excuse that the Quakers were not punished for *heresy*, but for *sedition and rebellion*. This is the present excuse, (as most people are aware;) but perhaps many are not aware that it was the old excuse also, and has had an

* Bancroft, i. 463, 341. † Horace, Sat. lib. ii. 3. 141.

‡ Bacon's Discourses, edit. 1839, p. 102.

§ Neal is staggered by their cruelty to the Quakers, and cannot steady *his* pen to say it was for *civil* offences. He says they were punished for their religion.—N. Eng. i. 284.

|| See Sewel, p. 273.

old answer. Yet this is the language that Gough holds.—"For as to the undermining or inciting to disaffection to the civil government to its ruin, these are no more than vague pretexts, unsupported by matter of fact. The usual subterfuge of persecution to strip itself of the odium of its real character is, to clothe religious dissent with the robe of sedition in the state."* And this is the plain comment of Douglass. "These banishments were under pretence of preserving the public peace, and preventing of sectary infection; and, as is natural to all zealots and bigots, they fell into the same error of rigidity which they complained of, upon their emigration from the Church of England. At a general synod in Newtown, near Boston, which was called August 30, 1637, *eighty* erroneous opinions were presented, debated, and condemned, and by the General Assembly or Legislature of the Colony, October 2d, following, some persons were banished."†

So it would seem that banishment for opinions' sake was no new thing in Massachusetts, it having begun twenty years before; and, too, long before any Quakers had made their appearance in the Colony: the *first* Quakers making their appearance, according to Dr. Holmes, in 1656.‡ And as to the folly of harassing the Quakers, the admonitory experience and sound counsel of her sister Rhode Island, in 1657, ought to have made Massachusetts cautious, if not clement. But no; her wrath in 1659 has grown hotter, instead of cooler. The Quakers must depart forever, or they must die. And if they died, there would be said over their graves, (if graves could be found for them,)§ what

* Gough, i. 376. Also ii. 34, 35, note.

† Douglass' Summary, ii. 76, note. ‡ Annals, i. 307.

§ One of the Lambeth Manuscripts of Dr. Hawks says, that refugees from Massachusetts to Rhode Island were driven away in such a helpless, destitute condition, that many of them at first had to live "in caves and in dens of the earth."

Rome says over the victims of the Inquisition, 'They perished for offences against the State: the Church is guiltless of their blood.'

Ah! how did Puritan Massachusetts forget her professed reverence for the Law of Moses! For there, in close alliance with statutes she pretended to honor, was the emphatic one about emigrants; which to her own legislators, (themselves emigrants,) ought to have been pathetically powerful: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him;" or as the margin reads, which they were more likely to see, than we in these days of no notes and comments, "ye shall not oppress him." (Levit. xix. 33.)

And how, too, did she forget her own law! For the language of her own statute directly contravenes the theory, that the Quakers suffered as rebels against the State, and not as heretical dissenters from the Church.* I say the language of her own statute; and I speak advisedly, notwithstanding the vindication put forth by Endicott & Co., which the Quarterly Review reminded Dr. Holmes he did but squint at. The bloody decree of 1658 does indeed talk of mutiny, sedition, and rebellion; but it talks of them as separate counts of an indictment.† They are associated with "the taking up, publishing, and defending the horrid opinions of the Quakers," not by the copulative *and*, but by the disjunctive *or*. This is a small thing, indeed; but it is not the first nor the thousandth time, a small thing has proved the gist of a matter. It unravels the whole affair. It shows that a person was liable, indeed, for provoking mutiny, but that he was *also*, and *besides* liable, for "taking up, publishing, and defending," certain *mere opinions*. And, now, what were those mere opinions? The

* Neal argues the same from another statute, and *he* must be right, if I am not. So the case is perfectly desperate. New England, i. 284.

† Hazard's Coll. ii. 562.

answer settles the case demonstratively. They were the opinions of the Quakers.

Will it still be said that Puritan Massachusetts never took human life for mere opinions? The statute in question gives me yet further aid, for a reply. It says, not only that Quakers shall themselves suffer, but that "adhering to, or approving of, any known Quakers, *or* the tenets or practices of the Quakers," shall render one liable to the same penalties, which might fall on the veriest devotee of the entire sect.* So that if a Congregationalist himself had gone so far as to adhere to a poor Quaker, out of sheer pity, or to say that with him he doubted the lawfulness of war,† (for that was one of "the horrid opinions," specifically and legislatively condemned, Anc. Col. Laws, p. 120,) he, too, would have been accounted a Quaker, to all intents and purposes, and, with the "cursed" object of his sympathy, have lost his home, or swung upon a gallows.‡

And even yet shall we be told Puritan Massachusetts never sentenced heresy *as* heresy? Never sentenced heresy? She sentenced the misprision of heresy. She manufactured constructive heresy, when she could not reach more nearly an opponent to her Draconian code; and for that crime—the crime of her own violent suspicions—hurried her victim to his doom. Now we are told that it is the very quintessence of tyranny, to make crimes constructive—that under a statute of constructive treason, *e. g.*, any one's life may be filched

* When Leddra was tried for his life, he asked what evil he had done. The answer was, "That he owned those Quakers that were put to death, and that they were innocent." Sewel, p. 274. This is *practical* commentary. Mr. Bacon is right; the laws were boldly maintained.

† Affording a Quaker entertainment was fatal to a military man. See Cudworth's case. Sewel, p. 226.

‡ Spur and Hazell were in danger of no one knows how much, had they not departed from Massachusetts, merely for sympathizing with a punished Baptist. So sympathy with *any* heretic was fatal. Neal's N. Eng. i. 253.

from him by inimical power.* Where then is the position of Puritan Massachusetts, in the history most unblessed of all on earth—the history of vindictive despotism?

But I have pursued an argument far enough, which any thing but undying prejudice might have spared me. I will therefore go back to Friend Sewel, whom I can now "adhere to and approve of" without risk of banishment, or a halter, and take up his story, which he said was "to be related hereafter."

This story refers to the execution of William Leddra, the sentence of Wenlock Christison to death, the imprisonment of *twenty-seven* of their brethren, who were released after Leddra was hung, in consequence of fears of royal interposition, and the release of a fresh batch, of I know not how many, whom the Puritans had, notwithstanding, contrived to bury in their dungeons, before the dreaded interposition actually came. Leddra suffered on the 14th of March, 1661. Christison was tried and condemned, about a fortnight after; but his sentence not executed—nay, he and twenty-seven more, among whom, says Sewel, p. 280, "there were then several that had been banished on pain of death," were suddenly set at liberty, after a sound whipping of two poor victims, by, as was usual, doubtless, "an able man."† So the final emancipation of the Quakers, one might suppose, happened on the first of April. And yet when the King's mandamus‡ actually arrived, in the following December, lo! the prison is full

* Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws, Lib. xii. ch. 7. Lieber's Hermeneutics, p. 137.

† Sewel, p. 226, speaking of a whipping Robinson was doomed to, as a harbinger of something worse, says, "and the constable was commanded to get an able man to do it." Puritan scourging was "slashing," as it has well been called.

‡ Oldmixon says, a Presbyterian high in office tried to stop this mandamus, and could not. Brit. Emp. in America, i. 108.

again, and set open *then*, in compliance with nothing but an imperative royal order!

After all, therefore, fear of the King drew the bolts of a Quaker's dungeon but for a little while; and as we shall presently see, the same fear exempted him, but for a short time, from the old penalties of banishment and death. The mandamus not only forbade death, but also "other corporal punishment;" and required Massachusetts to send its criminals to England, "that," says Charles, "such course may be taken with them here, as shall be agreeable to our laws and their demerits."* Hutchinson affirms that the Puritans "prudently complied with this instruction, and suspended the execution of the laws against the Quakers, so far as respected corporeal punishment, until further order."† On the same page, he says, "the laws were afterwards revived, so far as respected vagabond Quakers, whose punishment was limited to whipping, and, as a further favor, through three towns only!" But this is hardly a correct, it is most certainly not an exact account, of the position of things. Hutchinson blinks the fact, that the whipping "through three towns only," was the *solitary* exception, to the bloody and fiery laws of 1658 and 1661. The law of 1661, which allowed branding and death, though death not quite so quickly as the law of 1658, was revived, *after* the King's mandamus, viz., in 1662, (but a few months, probably, after its reception,) and ordained to "be henceforth in force, *in all respects*," with the nominal exception specified.‡

Oh, with what rueful reluctance, with what limping lenity, did Puritanism dole out the semblance of mercy to the victim of its execrations; and then, with the old scent of blood in its nostrils, again stretch out its arm to fasten him in its gripe of death! A Quaker was not to be whipped out of the Commonwealth as formerly, but if he returned,

* Sewel, p. 281. † Hutchinson, i. 188. ‡ Hazard's Col. ii. 611.

Puritanism, as her prompter Endicott said, would be just as ready to take his life, as he to risk it. A bare temporary suspension of an act of extermination, is all the boon which can be granted him; even at the instance of One, on whose favor the very safety of chartered rights was hanging.*

Nevertheless, says Mr. Bancroft, as if Massachusetts were to become a life-preserver instead of a life-destroyer to the Quaker, after the release of Christison and his twenty-seven companions, "the doctrine of toleration, with the pledges of peace, hovered like the dove at the window of the ark, waiting to be received into its rightful refuge."† Rightful refuge? The historian of the United States had better enliven his memory about the revival of the law of death, and then look back upon one of his own pages, and read the solemn refutation of himself, and of all other special pleaders for the merciless. "It has been attempted to excuse the atrocity of the law, because the Quakers avowed principles subversive of social order. Any government might, on the same grounds, find in its unreasonable fears an excuse for its cruelties. The argument justifies the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, of the Huguenots from France; and it forms a complete apology for Laud, who was honest in his bigotry, persecuting the Puritans with the same good faith, with which he recorded his dreams."‡

* This apparent submission to King Charles, and virtual insubmission to him, and deception of him, when they supposed he might have forgotten his mandamus, happened, it must be recollected, during the last years of Endicott's administration and life. He died in 1665, æt. 75. I have already quoted Tacitus in connexion with his name, and he so strongly reminds me of another parallel, that I must quote again. "Jam Tiberium corpus, jam vires, nondum dissimulatio deserebat. Idem animi rigor."—Tac. Ann. Liber vi. sect. 50.

† Bancroft, i. 458.

‡ Bancroft i. 454. Mr. B. cannot give Laud his due, without a sneer at the notice of dreams in his Diary. The compliment might be repaid by a sneer at his own consistency. Will it be believed? His ink is

But my pen will stray on too far; and it is time to teach it the Quaker virtue of quiescence, and bring this letter to a close.

It was my intention to have given some of the details of the execution of Leddra, who, through an entire "very cold winter," and during "night and day," and "in an open prison," was chained to a log, as though he had been a hyæna, and not a man—to show also, in Sewel's own style, how he was attended with a Puritan father-confessor, who, though he mocked him not with beads and a cross, did mock him with misapplications of Scripture—how his solemn appeal to his mother-country for justice, was not so much as noticed—how he was dragged to the scaffold, after the lecture was duly ended, by the Governor and his guards, and how, to the end, he "continued cheerful, and died like Stephen, exclaiming, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.'"

It was also my intention, to have inserted some account of the tedious trial and fearless replies of Wenlock Christison; who was doomed to death, but saved through the fears of a day-dream somewhat more substantial, than the night-visions of an old tormented Archbishop. For this I was the more disposed, since Chalmers says of him, in his Political Annals, "The spirit and talents displayed by Wenlock Christison on his trial, would have done honor to Sidney."* One little exquisite specimen of the logic of his judges is all, however, which I will specify.† Christison told them they

hardly dry, before he writes, on p. 455, "America was guilty of the death of four individuals, and they fell victims rather to the contest of will, than to the opinion that Quakerism is a capital crime." Mr. B. forgot the revived laws. No wonder he should forget Laud's Diary. "I am not moved by dreams," says the Archbishop, "yet I thought fit to remember this." Troubles &c. p. 57. His Diary, too, was for his own eyes alone. And if Prynne had not robbed him of it, and garbled it, none of us might have been the wiser for these visions of a Churchman's sleep. However, when Puritanism would talk of Laud's *harmless* superstition, let it remember its *life-taking* witchcraft some sixty years later!

* Annals, p. 191. † Gough, i. 480.

could not hang Quakers by their new law, because it was repugnant to the laws of England; and their charter forbade the enactment of any such law whatever. "I appeal," said he, "to the judicatories of our common country: *I never heard nor read of any statute that was in Old England to hang Quakers.*" Sound, statesmanlike reasoning. How was it answered? Why, they said, "there was a statute in England to hang the Jesuits." No wonder they were a fortnight in circumambulating to reach such a matchless conclusion!

But I forbear. Time and space will not permit me to enlarge, and perhaps many will think I have offered enough already, from some of the darkest chapters of human history —have dwelt sufficiently on deeds which Turks, Monks, Inquisitors, and "Salvages," to let Laud and High Commission judges pass as samples of comparative innocence, will rise up in judgment to condemn. I am willing to let the awful and opprobious records before me be closed; and have purposely given much of this letter by reference or quotation; for the blood of Quakers flows in my veins, and perhaps too warmly, while I linger over the bitter tale of their wrongs and their woes.

And yet, strange to say, my Episcopal blood comes through the same channel; as, to put some readers in better humor before parting, I am quite willing to tell. I find the following account of my Quaker ancestor, who became a Churchman, in Deane's History of Scituate, and give it in his own words. "He left Scituate in 1704, and settled in Newport. He had previously married Ruth, daughter of Deacon J. B., senior. To this match there had been several objections: the Quakers disapproved of his marrying *out of* the Society, and the Congregationalists of his marrying *into* theirs; and moreover, the woman was very young. However, the sanguine temperament of ——— was not to be foiled, and he is said to have addressed the young woman, in the presence of

her family, in the following words: 'Ruth, let us break away from this unreasonable bondage. I will give up my religion, and thou shalt give up thine, and we will go the Church of England, and go to the d—l together.' They fulfilled this resolution," adds my annalist, "*so far* as going to Church, and marrying, and adhering to the Church of England during life."

The anecdote shows that my worthy progenitor was somewhat rude, perhaps, in speech, "And little blest with the set phrase of peace." But I trust my fair readers, if I have any, will forgive him, for his devotion to his lady-love; and that sober Churchmen will excuse his language, as a true, if rough memento, of the opinions entertained of their communion by those, who once esteemed and avowed it a dear mother, from whom they had obtained all * their hope and part in the common salvation.

LETTER XVI.

My readers have now seen how the Puritans entertained Churchmen, Baptists, and Quakers. The present letter is to show, how they bore themselves towards Papists; whom, in a law against them, in 1647, they represent as the authors of "great combustions and divisions,"† and for whom,

* The exact language of the famous Arabella letter is, "ever acknowledging, that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation, we have received in her bosom, and sucked it from her breasts."

† There is no evidence to show, that the Jesuits had given the Puritans in New England any trouble, or were likely to do so. (Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. vi. 257.) Nevertheless, it was part of the orthodoxy of the day, to denounce Popery in the most unmeasured terms. For example,

therefore, they might have indulged, one would suppose, a little fellow-feeling.*

Another letter, perhaps, may be devoted to the Presbyterians and the Aborigines; and *that* probably will be deemed sufficient to establish my proposition, that the Puritans were tolerant of nobody but themselves—were a sort of Ishmaelites—and that, consequently, murmurs for a lack of complaisance come from their lips with a grace so ill, as to provoke the laugh of scorn. There will be less necessity for displaying their regards towards the honest Dutch; as it has been seen already, how frostily they looked upon a sturdy self-will, in which the Dutch were their full equals; and, too, how gratefully they remembered Dutch hospitality and toleration, when they reached this side of "the big water." The *Elders*, it will be recollected, esteemed the Dutch, what Napoleon did his soldiers, "food for gunpowder;" and would have had them duly excommunicated with a little cold lead.† As to the Gortonists, or Gortonians, it might have been entertaining, if not profitable, to give some account of their founder, whom the Governor of Massachusetts pronounced not fit to live upon the face of the earth, but whose last disciple was nevertheless

Milton calls it "the worst of superstitions, and the heaviest of *all* God's judgments," worse, of course, than Paganism or Deism.—Prose Works, p. 566.—Any one who should venture to say, with Bishop Montague, "I ought not to go farther from the Church of Rome in these her worst days, than she hath gone away from herself in her best days," was a Papist, black as jet, forthwith. That one sentence of Montague's Appeal, (p. 113,) was enough to doom him "to the sides of the pit." So, at the present day, the safe way of proving one's self a true Protestant, is to say with the Presbyterian Dr. Spring of New-York, that it were better to be an infidel than a Romanist. Then your piety and orthodoxy may pass muster.

* Let it here be remembered, that the professed starting-point of the Jesuits and Puritans was the same—the conversion of the infidels.

† Hutch. Hist. i. 167, 168–170.

discovered by President Stiles so late as 1771.* Mrs. Hutchinson, too, who conciliated such men as Sir Harry Vane † and Master Cotton, furnishes a romantic episode in Puritanic history; and might have done so with even greater wonders, if Sir Harry had not thought it wisest to retreat in time, and Master Cotton to trim his canvass to the breeze, so as to avoid the breakers ‡ Master Wheelright, also, into whose brain a crotchet or two had found its way, may be counted among Puritanic victims, though a Calvinist of the first water.§ And so may Mrs. Oliver; a lady whom Winthrop's Journal || pronounces, "for ability of speech and appearance of zeal and devotion, far before Mrs. Hutchinson." Her opinions, however, were quite too democratic for the Elders; and accordingly her lively tongue was deprived of its volubility by "a cleft stick." ¶ As a specimen of the vagaries of Puritanism, when it enters the department of jurisprudence, I might have sketched the famous "sow business," as Winthrop calls it, or, as it is styled by another author, "the great hog case." But I have neither time nor space to give *memorabilia* of these matters. Gorton's story might well repay one fond of antiquarian researches; but as his sect has perished, it would be less interesting to the general reader. There is a volume, however, now accessible, in which he may be heard for himself by the curious. It forms the second volume of the Collections of the Rhode Island Historical Society. Its title has been quoted already; but some may not be unwilling to be reminded of it again,

* R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 19, 57.

† Hubbard calls Vane a canter! N. Eng. p. 290.

‡ Hubbard p. 297. § Williamson's Maine, i. 293, 294.

|| Sav. Wint. i. 281, 2.

¶ So poor Bewet was banished, because he believed in perfection. This shows that the *Methodists* would have fared as hardly as any others, from Puritan hands, had they then existed as a sect. Hubbard, p. 277. Also Emerson's First Ch. pp. 70, 71.

as "Simplicity's Defence against seven-headed Policy" may have to be resorted to in other forms, and by other pens, when the arguments of the present writer are repeated with greater power, and by abler hands.

In respect to Puritans against Papists, I freely confess reluctance to commemorate severity towards those, whose pretensions to unchangeableness, if founded upon an aim at self-aggrandizement by any means, how costly soever to those around them—an aim as *infallibly* straight-ahead, through bright ages as through dark ones—might be substantiated beyond contradiction. Still, countries which have not made so much clatter about liberality and toleration, as the Utopia of the Puritans, have borne with Papists; and it certainly did not become pilgrims for conscience' sake, to be *better* in principle, but *poorer* in practice, than "dark places of the earth" which "are full of the habitations of cruelty." I say '*better* in principle, but *poorer* in practice'; for it is remarkable, (and the subject of my letter reminds me of such authorities,) that the ingenuousness of Massachusetts has been assailed by the most opposite testifiers, the Papists themselves, and the Calvinists of Connecticut.* Be it accounted for as it may, it is certainly curious to see D'Aulney, the French Governor of Acadia, on one side, talking of her "tricks of sleight," and begging to be dealt with "sincerely and without any equivocation;"† and to find Eliot in his Dictionary, on the other, saying that "Dr. Trumbull, a modern historian of excellent parts and

* King Charles's Commissioners, also, openly accused Massachusetts of "shuffling."—Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. viii. 80. The Presbyterians in England accused the Puritans there of similiar offences.—Edwards' Antapologia, p. 306.

† Hey, a remarkably liberal writer, accuses the Puritans of using pretexts. Jones of Nayland accuses them of corrupting the text of Scripture. The terrible sentence from the Monthly Anthology, has already been quoted in Note 72.—Hey's Lectures, 2d ed. iv. 86. Jones's Theol. Works, v. 62, 63.

character, has represented the conduct of Massachusetts, in not assisting the other colonies at the time, as most base and treacherous."* It is not my business to reconcile such singular historical phenomena, but I may be pardoned for mentioning the sagacious Winthrop's anticipation of them. In his "Modell of Christian Charity," written on board the Arabella while voyaging to New England, he endeavors to warn his associates upon the subject of worldly devotion and its consequences. If we, is his remonstrance, "*dissembling* with our God shall fall to embrace this present world, and prosecute our carnall intentions, seeking greate things for ourselves and our posterity, the Lord will surely breake out in wrathe against us."†

Let us come now to the first act of the drama, in which Puritans and Papists figure together on the soil of New England. Fortunately, it is rather an act of a comedy than of a tragedy: there being, as yet, no "bloody tenets", levelled at the heads of the devotees of Rome. La Tour, a name well known in New England history, (another French Governor, viz. of Nova Scotia,) was constrained "in his distress" to enter Boston harbor.‡ This was in 1643, when Winthrop, and not Endicott, was Governor. The result was, that the papistical visitant was treated with considerable hospitality. Perhaps, as on another occasion,§ he and his companions were even admitted to the board gubernatorial, on the Lord's Day. It is a palpable fact, that Winthrop dined some Romish gentlemen of distinction on a Sunday, and sent a file of musqueteers to escort them||—a freedom which the "Book of Sports" might have allowed; but which, unhappily for him, was not provided for in the "Coppie of the Liberties of the Massachusetts Colonie,"¶ which had as many eyes

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. vii. 103, 109. Eliot's Dict. p. 339.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. vii. 46.

‡ Hutchinson, i. 124. § Hutch. i. 127, note. || Ib.

¶ Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. viii. 216. In a hundred sections.

for sinners as Argus in the fable, i. e., a full and formidable hundred. Winthrop, who could sculpture a "Modell of Christian Charity," that the Puritans forgot as soon as the Israelites forgot the tablets of Moses, when occupied by a manufacture of their own, had a heart made of softer material than President Stiles's "oak." He sympathized even with Roger Williams;* that rebellious sower of sedition, and setter up of a conventicle, as the Hon. J. Q. Adams stamps him. It were worth his place, if not his life, to favor Williams openly; but by a secret and trusty messenger he points out to him the nearest and surest place of safety. Shakspeare says, that a good deed will not shine to a naughty world, any farther than a little candle throws its beams. But Shakspeare's "wise saws" are not without exceptions. A good deed will always shine far enough for an enemy to see it, if he can in any way construe it for our defamation. It is quite probable that Winthrop's attempt to copy his own "modell," subjected him to suspicion and distrust.† This, coupled with that farewell letter from the Arabella, tended, no doubt, to provoke the dispute to which Hutchinson alludes; ‡ and brought him under the worst insinuation to which he has ever been exposed—that of being *a covert Churchman.* "When he left England," says his biographer Belknap, "he was of a more catholic spirit than some of his brethren."§ No wonder that extraordinary concessions and efforts were necessary on his part, to avert the ill omens

* His son did also with Richard Leader, whose poor opinion of Endicott and a Puritanic church nearly cost him £50. His fine was remitted; doubtless at the intercession of a Winthrop, true to the spirit of his predecessor, who died pitying the heretics.—Felt's Salem 183, 184.

† Savage's Wint. i. 178. He is severely reproached for not being strict enough. He could not forget his solemn professions in the Arabella letter, so soon as Rev. Mr. Phillips, though he was but a layman.—Sav. Wint. i. 14, note.

‡ Hutch. Hist. i. 24.

§ Belk. Biog, ii. 356. And see Note, 96, about his Prayer Book.

which were hovering about his name. No wonder that he was a strenuous opponent of the Episcopal and Presbyterian petition of 1646. "He fell in with the reigning principle of intolerancy," is the testimony of Belknap. He was reluctantly forced to wear the iron collar of "seven-headed policy," I should myself prefer to express it. And that I am right is my full belief, when I encounter the honorable and penitent relentings of his final hours. "Upon his death-bed, when Mr. Dudley pressed him to sign an order of banishment of a heterodox person, he refused, saying, '*I have done too much of that work already.*' "*

Here the unsophisticated temper of truth broke out, and we see this good man speaking and acting his better and genuine self. And under the influence of that temper he began to act, when the Papists first and unexpectedly made their appearance at the capital of Massachusetts. Monsieur La Tour put in there, very suddenly, in the summer of 1643; and, though a Papist himself, had worldly wisdom enough to come in a ship, whose master and crew were Protestants from the celebrated Huguenot port of Rochelle.† But with all this Protestant leaven, it did not answer for Winthrop to manifest the consideration which he did for its papistical concomitants. His kindness to La Tour provoked a "judicious minister," as he himself, perhaps sarcastically, calls him, to prophesy, that "store of blood would be spilled in Boston." "Divers also," his narrative continues, "wrote to the Governor, laying before him great dangers, others charging sin upon the conscience in all these proceedings." And again, others argued, "That La Tour is a Papist, attended by priests, friars, &c.; and that they were in the case of Jehoshaphat who joined with Ahab, an idolater."‡

* Hutch. Hist. i. 142. Hubbard and Mather are silent about any authority for this fact, says Mr. Savage, "*perhaps from design.*"—Sav. Wint. ii. 174, note.

† Hutchinson, i. 122.

‡ Ibid. 123, note.

The poor Governor is beleaguered and bewildered. He is obliged to call a meeting, in which it was gravely and astutely queried, "Whether it were lawful for Christians to aid idolaters,[115] and how far we may hold communion with them?"* Upon the discussion it were needless to dwell; but I must beg attention to the censure passed upon the Governor's errors in this affair, which superstition magnified from a mole-hill into a mountain. One was that he and his coadjutors did not advise "with any of the Elders, as their manner was in *matters of less consequence*."† That was a mistake which such as Dudley, who wanted a dying man's signature to a penal warrant, knew well enough how to avoid. He could thank God he died "no libertine." It was no part of his libertinism, when he had dealings with Papists, to forget the Inquisitors of his own sect. Under his auspices the Elders are consulted most deferentially.‡

It is easy to see from this, who always pulled the wires. The government of Massachusetts, (or PURITANIA; if I might make a word to embrace more territory, and exactly all which my observation applies to,) was virtually an ecclesiastical aristocracy. It was a grade above such an Establishment as that of England, where the Church is nominally first, but practically the second, and the subordinate.§ There is nothing akin to it in history, but that tremendous engine of Popery—heresy's most awful battering-ram, 'The Holy and Apostolic Court of the Inquisition'—which we have the highest juridical authority for pronouncing, any thing but a stranger to this soil of spiritual freedom.‖ Strange indeed it is, as some may think, that its twin

[115] See Note 115.

* Savage's Winthrop, ii. 109. † Ibid. ii. 128.

‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. vii. 107.

§ The usual phrase is, "Church and State;" but the phrase as acted on is, "State and Church." ‖ Story's Misc. p. 66.

sister could not discover for it a little more of the sympathy of consanguinity; but we know it is as old as human nature, that two of a trade cannot agree.

In 1647, for what purpose, particularly, does not appear, a severe law was passed against the Jesuits.* Its preamble seems to indicate a knowledge of great commotions, occasioned by them in Europe, and that the law was made by way of welcome, when, after troubling Europe sufficiently, the Jesuits should try their dexterity in raising a storm in New England. However, the Puritans, as Hubbard testifies,† had been more scared than hurt by the Papists, on a former occasion; and they might at least have had the grace to wait, till actually assailed by them. But no, like Job's war-horse, who "smelleth the battle afar off," they were rather eager for the onset; having already tried their powers upon the unfortunate Anabaptists. One portion of the law is curious. It marks the native coincidences between the Inquisition of Puritanism and the Inquisition of Popery. Both condemn upon bare suspicion.‡ Any person in Boston who gave "just cause of suspicion" that he was a Papist, (and of the *justice*, a Puritan of course was the sole judge; so that justice lay in his own conjecture,) might be arrested, and doomed to a task as hopeless as that of Sisyphus—the rolling of such suspicion effectually away. In plain English, only suspect a person of Popery, and you might banish him at your convenience. Bring him a second time within your reach, and you could hang him at your leisure.

I can forgive the Puritans for apprehensions of a sect, which, wherever they go, are perpetually tampering with government and education, so as to control "mind, body, and estate," and which even the Doctors of the Sorbonne

* Holmes's Annals, i. 285. Hazard's Coll. i. 550. Anc. Col. Laws, p. 129.

† N. Eng p. 61. ‡ Limborch's Inquisition, B. iii. ch. 11.

thus lash: "Videtur hæc societas, in negotio fidei periculosa, pacis Ecclesiæ perturbativa, religionis rectæ eversiva; et magis ad destructionem quam ad ædificationem."* But their law was actuated by any temper save that of the benign Ganganelli, when he suppressed an Order whose *name* is the best, and whose *practice* the worst, of all associations.† It allowed any judge, after the fashion of the Inquisition, to suspect, and, according to his suspicion, to doom to infamy or death the victim of popular prejudice. Nor so only, but it must be interpreted by the practices with which it was surrounded—by the restless warfare carried on against Churchmen, Baptists, Quakers, Presbyterians, Gortonians, Hutchinsonians, Seekers, and the Aborigines ‡—against all indeed of every name, who doubted of *their* "civil government and church-order," or *their* "orthodox received opinions."

So late as A. D. 1700, another law, whose penalties were perpetual imprisonment or death, was made against the Papists. It is almost unaccountable, that Mr. Walsh, (himself I suppose a Papist,) should have forgotten this, and that he will have it, that all traces of New England persecution had passed away at the close of the seventeenth century; when that very close attested the hurling of such a bolt of vengeance, at the Church he calls a Holy Mother. The act is prefaced with an apology for its severity: the Papists, the Jesuits especially, were supposed to be attempering the Indians for the purposes of France. Yet it bears the old ensigns of inquisitorial cruelty. It not only condemned the professed Papist, but all who should "otherwise

* Heylin's Presbyterians, p. 482.

† Possibly, some persons may not understand, that Jesuit is derived from Jesus; and means, *par excellence*, a follower of Jesus Christ!!

‡ And as Bewet's case shows, the *Methodists*, too, must have been written in this list, had they existed as a sect. See the note on Bewet, near the beginning of this Letter, p. 335.

appear to be such."* It allowed any suspected person to be apprehended "without warrant." Now the use of "the sign of the cross," is not peculiar to Papists;† but in such times as could justify Endicott's logic, that a law against a Jesuit is law enough to hang a Quaker, this law might have been employed against a Churchman, and made his fate no better than that of an emissary of Rome. Henry VIII. sent the denier of *his* supremacy, and the denier of the Pope's supremacy, to execution upon the same hurdle. Let persecution have been as safe in the administration of Endicott, and *he* would have found a law against the Jesuits sufficient wherewith to decapitate a whole bench of bishops.

With the laws of Puritan Massachusetts respecting Popery, let us now compare the following sentiment uttered by a Churchman and a priest, in our own country, *previous* to our Revolution. "I do contend," he says, "that Papists should, both of right and in point of prudence, be put upon a footing in this respect, ['civil restraints,'] with other dissenters."‡ Compare with it also the violence with which Independents (alias Puritans) upbraided the Parliament and Administration of Great Britain for "misgovernment," because a statute was passed by them, denominated the Quebec Act—an act by which Papists were tolerated in a province, where they constituted "almost the whole of its inhabitants."§

Now this Quebec Act, according to Dr. Holmes,|| dates as far down as 1774; so that till so late a period, it appears

* See Eliot's edit. Mass. Laws, 1726, p. 134, folio.

† Nor to Lutherans or to Calvinists. The Rev. Dr. Jarvis informed me he saw a gilt cross in the church of the celebrated Mr. D'Aubigne, author of the History of the Reformation, and that Mr. D. congratulated himself that it was not a crucifix! That was *his* distinction; and yet Mr. D. is one of the most famous Anti-Puseyites of the day.—The Lutherans, *the* Protestants by descent, have the crucifix.

‡ Boucher's Disc. p. 270. § Boucher's Disc. p. 242.

|| Annals, ii. 186.

that the Papists would have encountered no more cheerful welcome from the Puritans, than in 1647 or 1700. In 1700, apprehension without warrant, and perpetual imprisonment or death, was their due by Puritan law; though Dr. Holmes suppresses all the ugly features of the statute, and merely tells us they were required to go away!* He is *careful* enough to tell us, the Inquisition was established in South America in 1570, by Philip II. of Spain;† whom the Dutch used to call a demon. And Justice Story is *frank* enough to tell us, it was virtually established in Massachusetts, at a much later date, and by a people whom themselves have called "stars," "patriarchs," "sons of liberty;" and I know not by how many more brilliant, venerable, and patriotic names.

It is sufficiently clear, however, that one class of the community, (the Papists,) even when bigoted Churchmen were disposed to tolerate them, and, as in Canada, did actually tolerate them, that this class would have received from them a scanty as portion of mercy as ever. If "writs of assistance,"‡ (which I by no means defend, for I believe my country was cruelly oppressed by Great Britain; as she never would have been, if statesmen like Chatham, Camden, and Burke, had been listened to,) if, I say, "writs of assistance" had only been designed for the sheriffs to drag Papists to execution, fearfully they would have provoked but faint objections from Puritan lawyers. I must believe this, and that Puritanism has in it the essential elements of exclusiveness and supremacy; else, why should it denounce the British Government for an act of bare justice to Popish Canada? Else, why should a Puritan write so vehemently against canon and feudal law, and try to persuade the American Colonies to believe the chimera, that a British Episcopal

* Holmes's Annals, i. 476. † Holmes's Annals, i. 90.

‡ For some account of these writs, see Holmes's Annals, ii. 104.—Tudor's Otis, p. 52, etc.

Missionary Society was scheming to inflict the first (at least) upon them;* when no sooner is that Puritan a President of the United States, than he himself inflicts upon them an alien and a sedition law? It is no marvel that alien and sedition laws,† [alias gag-laws, &c., as the familiar phrase was in my boyhood,] should come from Massachusetts, which gave us that chief magistrate under whose auspices these laws were engendered. The paternity of such laws is no perplexing problem, to any one familiar with the early history of New England. Puritanism claims to have inspired freedom into the British Constitution. I have yet to be taught, that we are to thank it for any which it has breathed into our own.

I regret to have imposed upon me, the necessity of mingling political with ecclesiastical considerations. But the semi-political nature of the case before me requires it. It was politics, as we have before seen, quite as much or more than religion, which occasioned the movements of the Puritans against the Church of England. It was political expediency by which they justified their ecclesiastical prejudices against Baptists, Quakers, &c., &c., on this side of the Atlantic, and by which they defended their terrific laws against them. The preambles of the laws of 1647 and 1700 against the Papists, refer to political considerations principally or only; and most certainly the objections to the Quebec Act must have been political, and only so—for what cared the Puritans for the celebration of the Mass, where not a soul of them would ever see it?

Are not considerations like these sufficient warrant for saying, that the exclusion of Papists from toleration in the Charter of William and Mary in 1691, though *nominally* the work of England, was *virtually* the work of the Puritans? They were insatiate fault-finders with every form of government and of religion, but their own. Time was, in-

* Holmes's Annals, ii. 120, and note.

† Acts of Congress, vol. iv. pp. 133, 202.

deed, when to them, as to old Daniel Burgess, "a thwack at Popery" was the best of all cures for a heart-burn. By and by, however, a thwack at Protestant Episcopacy became as good if not a better. And how did the Church of England deport herself beneath their ungentle smitings? did it bristle and mutter, as they did under the remonstrances of King Charles by his Commissioners? Let us see.

To say nothing of the Prayer Book, they denounce the very Bible of the nation. And what then? Why, the very monarch, whose phrase "No bishop, no king," has so often been quoted against him, and by which he merely meant, that if he allowed the Government's enemies to say "No bishop," they would forthwith say "No king too"—even he listens to them, and appoints a commission to meet *their* wishes.* This is a fact but little known, and still less alluded to; and yet it is distinctly stated in the Address of the Translators to the reader of the Bible of 1611, our present translation; where the Puritans and the Hampton Court Conference are alluded to *by name*, and due pains taken to show how much was conceded "to satisfy our scrupulous brethren."[116] It is neither impossible nor improbable, that this fact, so decidedly evidential of the liberality of Churchmen, has helped, among other things, to dismiss that Address into oblivion. One looks for it in vain in the volumes of an association, professing to give us a genuine book—the American Bible Society. A quarto Bible of this Society was put into my pulpit, because it was *cheap;* but I paid *dear* for it one day, when turning to quote from it, I found not so much as even the old Dedication suffered to remain.†

[116] See Note 116.

---

* Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 182, 227.

† So the anti-episcopal punctuation of Matt. xix. 28, and on which hinges a controversy about "regeneration," is preferred; and this in direct violation of the model of 1611, and English Bibles generally.

Be these things, however, as they may, it is not in relation to the Bible only, that Churchmen manifested a disposition to conciliate. And if all the Puritans had been like Baxter in his youth, or Lightfoot in old age, or as well-tempered as Dr. Reynolds, who objected to the phrase in the marriage-service, "With my body I thee worship," and was smiled down by the king, who said, "If you had a good wife yourself, you would think all the worship and honor you could do her were well bestowed"—if all had been like these, there had been small difficulty. Still, with dispositions the most testy, and tongues the most clamorous, the Puritans again and again importuned for a hearing upon the subject of liturgical reform. They are listened to, and answered. To their tiresome and provoking cavils, it is doubtless owing, that some acknowledged blemishes in the Liturgy of the Church of England are not yet obliterated.* The Government of England could never pacify them; and Mr. Bancroft has characterized them truly, when he says that they were "the harbingers of a revolution.† Do what it might, say what it would, it could not ingratiate them. Like the children in the market-place, if piped unto, they would not dance; if mourned with, they would not lament. And the simple secret is, they wanted not reform but revolution.‡ They wanted the nation's eminence, the nation's wealth, the nation's strength; and as Neal himself allows, "they were dissatisfied for the want of the *top-stone* of the building, *church-power*."|| It suited them in their chagrin and in their interests, to charge the Government with secret "papistry." Thus, while the Pope was trying to destroy it one way, they were trying to destroy it by another; and so

* Compare the quotations from Bishop Meade, in note 39.—"They fled me so from argument to argument," &c., said King James.—See Cardwell's Conferences, for James's letter, p. 161. Also p. 314, &c.

† Bancroft, i. 284. ‡ Churchman Armed, i. 493.

§ Neal iii. 364. And his italics. Quoted by Lathbury, p. 329.

"placed, as it were, between the upper and the nether millstone," there was good hope that Protestant Episcopacy would be ground to powder!*

Now the Government knew this, and realized it all. Archbishops Parker, and Bancroft, and Laud, saw through it with half an eye; as has been stated in my second Letter. But the Government also knew, that as the passions of the populace had been addressed, effectually too, against themselves, the only method left them was, as combatants drawn into battle, to meet the foe on ground of his own selection. They did so. They manifested a hostility, *all* of which was not felt, against those whose covert allies they were calumniously pronounced to be.† Shot were hurled against the Papists, which, but for the taunts of revolutionary Puritans, might have slept uncast to this passing hour. Perfect freedom in religious opinions was granted to Rhode Island, agreeably to her own wish, in her Charter of 1663.‡ And the same freedom would have been granted to Massachusetts, had she desired it, in 1691. But no. Massachusetts wanted her own way in every thing. She contended stoutly for such a trifle as the pre-eminence among her sister colonies, in all the acts and meetings of their commissioners.§ And so she contended for as much of her habitual exclusiveness, as could be inserted into her later charter.|| A charter, without some intolerance, would have been like salt that had lost its savor, to palates for which a certain kind of *seasoning* had become quite indispensable. The later charter, accordingly, had an infusion of the requisite ingredient; and the exigencies of the times made it brine of smarting severity for the unhappy Papist.

* Le Bas's Jewel, pp. 184, 185. † Wynne's America, i. 237.

‡ Hazard, ii. 613. § Ibid. ii. 14, 99.

|| She would receive the Scotch and sell them into slavery; (See Note 88;) but Irish *settlers* she tried to bar out.—More's Annals of Concord, pp. 7, 8. Compare Oldmixon's Brit. Emp. in America i. 110.

The sentence of utter exclusion against Papists, reinforced by a law of perpetual imprisonment and death, was then, I contend, virtually of Puritan extraction; for, if by combination, (such a combination as they charged upon the English Government,) the Puritans could themselves have acquired ascendency enough, to overturn the British Constitution, they would have endured any alliance with Popery, as dissenters and radicals are doing now.* A very "solemn League and Covenant," as one of the darkest periods of English history has effectually proved, can bring strange materials together. If Romanism had had the blind might of Samson to bow the pillars of the Governmental fabric, Puritanism, as the little boy who aided the Jewish Hercules, would have led her to the *point d'appuis,* and guided her destructive hands.

Yes, Puritanism would have done, in ages past, what Dissent is ready to do, and striving to do, in this current hour. Dissent would blithesomely overturn a Government, which keeps a balance in a hemisphere; even though it must die in the entombment of its accounted foe. And die it will, if it succeed in bringing England to the desolation of an agrarian level. Like the sinner who perishes utterly in his own corruption,† it will be crushed in the ruin it will have wrought. It is easy to fire a train, that will toss rocks about more readily than did the fabled Titans; but who can say to it, when kindled, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further?" "In the Grand Rebellion, all the sectaries combined to pull down the Church and they succeeded—but what followed?—The Roman Catholics vanished before the Presbyterians. The Presbyterians, in their turn, became as odious as the Church had been, and were soon overthrown and oppressed by the Independents; who, again, broke up into a hundred intolerant and fanatical factions, from which

* British Critic, xvii. 194, 198.

† 2 Peter ii. 12.

the weary and woful nation—Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Independents, and all, were glad once again to take refuge under the protection of an 'Establishment in Church and State.'"* I quote such testimony, with impartiality; for, to Establishments, as such, I am no friend. I feel under no obligation to approve them upon principle, and can frankly say, I love them not, but glory in the Constitution of my country, which forbids all civil trammels upon religion.

That the fears which the Puritans professed to have of the terrible machinations of the Jesuits were just, I am willing to allow, (not for their *sincerity;* since, if it suited them, they could plead the privileges of a Bull of the infamous Alexander VI., when it allowed them to open their mouths against the Church of England;)† but because those fears were shared by all the Protestant governments of their time and are *not yet* lulled to sleep. There is no system that has loved, that still loves the mistress Diotrephes so assiduously courted, (3 John 9,) as this; which, with its vows of unlimited obedience, can wield all its energies with consummate despotism, and, in its recklessness of means, walk over the bloody and smoking ruins of a nation with unfaltering serenity. No system is there, at whose doors such piles of sinful consequences lie; for it is one, which, if there be a Purgatory, can furnish it with such a plenitude of business to cleanse itself, as to let the rest of the world go free.

Still, upon the principle that even the "murderer from the beginning" should have his due, one could wish that Jesuit missionaries had not experienced quite such caustic manipulation, as they sometimes have, from those who profess to be their superiors, and, indeed, the superiors of all men, in their love of liberty and charity. I say not their

* Quart. Review, No. 100, p. 510, Am. Ed.

† Admitted by Neal, i. 242, 243. In view of this, the Puritans ought never to object to *holy orders*, even if they do come through Rome.

superiors in *devotion;* for, whether from a right motive, or a wrong, more exemplary instances of the complete surrender of men to the requirements of their calling, than have been seen in Jesuit missionaries, are not furnished by human history. And this, too, when the men who have presented these instances, have not been the ignorant, the low-born, or the low-bred, among their fellows. Sebastian Rallè, or Rasle, who spent thirty-seven years of his life with the Indians, and was missionary at Norridgewock, in Maine, is styled "a man of superior sense, and profound learning, and particularly skilled in Latin, which he wrote with classical purity."* He compiled a dictionary of the Abnakis language, "a quarto volume of above five hundred pages," which was seized among his papers, when he once escaped from those musket-balls, formerly current coin in PURITANIA for the cheap dispatch of bishops, and is now preserved in the library of Harvard University.† Chaumont toiled among the Hurons for half a century. He composed a grammar of the Huron tongue. Venegas, in his curious history of California, shows with what indefatigable toil his brethren exerted themselves, in one of the remotest quarters of the world. Salva-Tierra, "the apostle of California," would have been "twice a saint," and eclipsed David Brainerd himself, had he but accomplished, as a Puritan, what he did as a Jesuit.‡ Bishop Laval was a sufficiently good Papist; though I cannot say he was *in form* a Jesuit, as I am under the impression, that the stringent oath of a Romish bishop to the Pope, interferes with allegiance to the general of a monastic order. Laval was the first bishop of

* See a memoir of him, Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. viii. 290.—Compare also Drake's Book of the Indians, B. iii. pp. 127, 128, edit. 9th. Drake says the English actually scalped the missionary: thus proving themselves savages in very deed.

† Pickering on Indian Orthography, p. 40.

‡ Venegas's California, i. 219, etc.

Canada, and came over in 1659. He was such an enemy to alcohol, and such a devotee to cold water, that I doubt if *tavern lectures* would have escaped as easily under his administration, as under that of the Puritans. They forbade tavern lectures, till the witching hour of eleven in the forenoon had passed.* Laval, I fear, would have prohibited them totally; and would have made the grocers do long penance, if they demanded of him, (as they did demand, and obtain too of the Puritans,) a profit of more than *one third per cent.*, on "cheese, wine, oil, and strong water."†—Mr. Bancroft himself, with all his Puritan proclivities, seems quite enamored of the romance in a Jesuit missionary's life; talks poetically about "the illustrious triumvirate, Alloüez, Dablon, and Marquette;"‡ and devotes page after page, to a sort of novel-writing about them and their contemporaries. However, so imaginative a gentleman may well be pardoned, when Colden, a person of very different temperament, does not hesitate to allow, that "one cannot but admire the zeal, courage, and resolution of these Jesuits, that would adventure to live among Indians at war with their nation; and the better to carry their purposes, to comply with all the humors and manners of such a wild people; so as not to be distinguished by strangers from mere Indians."§

In fine—to go on quoting; for if I use my own language here, I shall infallibly be accused of being secretly a Jesuit myself—says Major Stoddard, who, as a military man, would not be inclined to over-estimate the hum-drum life of a priest: "Of the labors of these missionaries we may form some judgment from the accounts they have left us of their travels.

* Felt's Salem, p. 61.

† Felt's Salem, p. 62.—Winthrop congratulates Massachusetts on having wine very plentiful, "through the Lord's blessing." And then calls the Virginia clergy a set of drunkards!!—Sav. Wint. ii. 22, 95.

‡ Bancroft, iii. 152. § Colden's Five Nations, i. 60.

They encountered the greatest hardships, and frequently exposed their lives to the merciless tomahawks of the savages. In propagating their religion, they braved death in ten thousand shapes; they have left to their successors in the same vineyard, though few of this description now remain, examples of suffering and patience, which alone could result from an elevated faith and a well-grounded hope."* Chateaubriand may of course be suspected of no inconsiderable partiality. Still, in the fourth book of his "Beauties of Christianity," he has given instances, that, aside from the drapery in which his imagination and eloquence have clothed them, can sustain his eulogy in pronouncing them a display of "miracles of the arts, of laws, of humanity and courage, in the four quarters of the globe."

Recalling things like these, and pondering on them as a philanthropist, without regard to religious differences, one cannot but reflect with pain, that for suspicions wholly, (at least mostly,) £500 were offered for Rallè alive or dead, and that he was finally murdered and mangled by those, whose fathers came to our far-off shores, ostensibly for the same kind and sacred purpose to which he had given up his comfort, health and life, viz., the conversion of the savages.† It should never be forgotten, that this was "*the* principal end" of the settlement of Massachusetts, by the "free profession" of its earliest inhabitants. Notwithstanding, with savages only for associates and nurses, Rallè found himself the victim of sufferings that required the gentlest alleviations. His last years dragged heavily along, amid debility and sickness; yet he never left his post, and spent his latest strength in attempting to stop an effusion of blood, or in defence of his fireside. It is melancholy to think of

* Stoddard's Louisiana, p. 315. Compare Wynne's America, i. 309, etc.

† Williamson's Maine, ii. 102.

his lonely grave and shattered chapel, as the only ruins of an extensive mission; but these are all which remained seventy years since, and the vestiges of these now, perhaps, have vanished.*

Indeed, the Jesuit missionaries, at the lowest estimate, often deserve our pity; and when we see what a monument of philosophy and erudition they have reared for themselves, in their *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*,† we must respect their labors if we condemn their creed.[117]

In connexion with such matters, Papists will probably think I ought to comment severely on the bearing of the Puritans towards them, because of their prior and superior love of human rights and liberties, and their embarking as they did in the cause of our memorable Revolution. But if so, I must disappoint them. Closer examination constrains me to retract, somewhat, from the praise once bestowed on the Baron of Baltimore, and the early Romish settlers of Maryland. Lord Baltimore had refused the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, tendered him in the Old Dominion. "It was evident" therefore, says Bancroft,‡ "that Lord Baltimore could never hope for quiet, in any attempt at establishing a colony within the jurisdiction of Virginia." The papistical principles of his family, thus proving a hinderance at the outset, as indeed they did long afterward,§ it became necessary to put them in abeyance. I am induced accordingly to believe, that surrounded as they were by jealous and stronger settlements, the Papists became satisfied that their success depended upon an at-

[117] See Note 117.

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. ii. 231.

† An edition of these, seventy years ago, amounted to thirty volumes. Since, I suppose, they have much increased; though I have not the means at hand of ascertaining. See Catalogue of the Library of Harv. University, i. 468. Also Watts' Bibliotheca, i. 420. *u.*

‡ Bancroft, i. 241.

§ Proud's Pennsylvania, i. 121.

tractive, and, to them, entirely novel plan. So they placed in the background the natural exclusiveness of their system, and opened their doors, as David did * when overawed by necessity, to whomsoever would enter.† For the increase of a new state, which, if it rose at all, had to rise in the neighborhood of formidable rivals, must depend on its possession of attractions which might win those, who hung loosely on the skirts of its superiors. Moreover, the celebrated act of 1638–9, which gave "Holy Church within this province," "all her rights, liberties, and franchises, wholly and without blemish," was passed, so Chalmers assures us, because "of a laudable jealousy of the papal jurisdiction"‡—in other words, to keep "Holy Church" abroad, from overstepping, as she was wont to do, the modesty of equal rights and privileges; and to let "Holy Church" at home know, she should have just her own, and nothing more. In addition to this, a contemporary quoted by Dr. Hawks, also assures us, that the celebrated act of toleration of 1649 was passed by a legislature, in which the Papists formed but *one* part out of *several!* § Mr. Knowles, therefore, in his memoir of Roger Williams, is justified in disputing the alleged priority of the Papists in the cause of religious freedom, on *this* ground, rather than on the one he contends for; since on *that* they can answer him by saying, that Rhode Island did not tolerate Papists till the virtual independence of these States, i. e., February, 1783. I allude here to a matter, about which there has been no little clangor; but the discovery of the Rhode Island act of February, 1783, by Mr. Howland, settles the difficulty at last.||

* 1 Sam. xxii. 2.

† Even Mr. Walsh says Episcopalians were *unavoidably* toler ated. Appeal, p. 428.

‡ Annals, p. 213.

§ Leah and Rachell, quoted in Hawks's Maryland, p. 35.

|| See Holmes's Annals, i. 336. Walsh's Appeal, p. 427, etc. Knowles's

And as to the hearty, at least the spontaneous, devotion of Romanists in the doubtful and anxious warfare of our American patriots, this also may, I hope, be questioned, without sectarian malevolence. Boucher, who seems to have been their friend, and who pleaded nobly and fervently for their toleration, in an hour when the most sagacious politicians thought it not advisable, declares that they hesitated not a little; and maintained to the last moment a neutrality, which would allow them to join a victorious party safely, and shelter their persons and opulence, of which they had *no small share*, beneath the wing of its protection. He declares, too, that they were looked at askant by our whigs; who suspected them of an inward proclivity for toryism, and accounted their ostensible perpendicularity as somewhat critical.* Another contemporary also says, they had lost their former political influence in the State;† which, of course, it was highly important to regain. Their "irresolution," according to Boucher, "drew down on them many suspicions, censures, and threats." And he adds, that one

Memoir Rog. Williams, p. 321, etc. Verplanck's Discourses, p. 86. Also Gammell's Life of Williams, Sparks' Am. Biog. 2d ser. iv. 209, etc.—The act of 1783, which *repeals* the exception against the Roman Catholics, may be found in Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. v. pp. 243, 244. It is surprising that Mr. Gammell should not have seen it, and that Mr. Sparks should allow Mr. Gammell to repeat the arguments of Mr. Walsh, which it effectually explodes. It may not be amiss to add here, that the settlement of this controversy reflects most favorably upon the accuracy of Mr. Chalmers, who, in his Political Annals, was the first to say Rhode Island had passed a law refusing toleration to Roman Catholics. Chalmers has made so many statements, which the Puritans dislike, they have been glad to lower his authority. The attack upon him has only redounded to his honor. His assailants, in the old fashioned language of the Prayer Book, have fallen themselves into the destruction that they made for another.

* Boucher's Discourses, p. 242. Boucher was familiar with both Virginia and Maryland, *before* the Revolution. Disc. p. xc. Pref.

† Mr. Surveyor Eddis. Letters, p. 46.

object of his own plea for toleration was, actually, "to save them from persecution;" for which act of charity he was no doubt duly honored with the suspicion of being himself a Jesuit in disguise.

"At length," he continues, "a [Roman] Catholic gentleman of good abilities, who was possessed of one of the *first fortunes* in that country," "openly espoused the cause of Congress." This was Mr. Carroll; who, it would seem, finding at length when the combat deepened, that he and his fellow-believers had but the two alternatives, of confiscation or "rebellion," abandoned neutrality and sought alliance with those, from whom danger was *nearest*. When this was done—the Rubicon crossed—a careful manifestation of fealty became necessary, to wipe away the stains which had been attached to them. A part of this manifestation might have been the appearance of Mr. Carroll upon the floor of Congress; since he was the *leading man* of the Romanists of Maryland. Boucher, however, does not hesitate to say, that the personal ambition of Mr. C. had a part in the production of this (as matters had stood) rather singular result. "He was actuated," is his testimony, "as was generally thought, solely by his desire to become a public man;" or, as I may say, to regain that political influence for his friends, which Mr. Eddis declares they had lost.

These may be ungracious facts in the view of some; but if true, we have a right to know, and must in candor, though with regret, admit them. That there is, upon the lowest estimate, a *verisimilitude* about them which we cannot blink, is clear. Nor must it be forgotten, that they are given upon the authority of one, who was even a phenomenon among the politicians of his day, for his liberal opinions upon that long litigated and agitating topic—the toleration or relief of Roman Catholics. For myself, and without the fear of the Inquisition before my eyes, I avow it to be as

difficult for me, as it was for the patriotic Episcopalians, who were the great majority in Maryland in the days of '76,* to believe that there is any more elective affinity between Popery and republicanism, than between an acid and an alkali. True, Popery has a phase for every *quarter*, like the moon in the sky, and the contrary may appear to be the fact. Popery publishes Bibles in this country, because she cannot help herself. But in Austria she prohibits even a Hebrew Bible, to a passing traveller.† So I am constrained to believe, that, as respects their genuine dispositions, Popery and a free government are as unlike as our arctic and temperate zones. The one cannot endure the climate of the other, better than a polar bear a transportation from his native latitude. "Whether," says the British Critic, "we consult the annals of experience, or the oracles of reason—whether we survey the present or the past—we gather only fresh confirmation of our belief, that republicanism and [Roman] Catholicism cannot long, or flourishingly, or comfortably, coexist.‡

That this is true, is evinced by what some may think trifles worthy only of a smile, but which are certainly worthy one serious glance, if there is any sense in the old proverb, that straws can show how the wind is setting. It is notorious, that Papists do, *among themselves*, assign some of their clergy titles, and render them a homage—bending even the knee to them—which never existed but under their system, or a monarchy. Their bishops are freely addressed as "My lord"—their bishops' houses, though never so humble, are looked upon as the abodes of a spiritual prince, and denominated "palaces"—their bishops'

* Eddis's Letters, p. 46.

† Church of Eng. Quart. Rev. October, 1844, p. 419.—Edward Leigh said, nearly two hundred years ago, that Popery made it a capital crime to read the Bible in Spain and Italy; but allowed it in England and France, where she could not help it.—Leigh's Religion and Learning, p. 22. London, 1656.

‡ Brit. Crit. xvii. 198.

churches are called "cathedrals." In the Popish Almanac, intended most probably for few or none but believing optics, a republican eye detects, as the unpropitious caption of their clerical catalogue, "THE HIERARCHY OF THE UNITED STATES."* It is printed here, in type of their own chosen size; and I cannot but request a moment's attention to its supernal phraseology. It would appear that these dignitaries are indeed magnates of the "Mother of us all;" for they are described as having hierarchical empire over our whole Union.† It will be said, perhaps, this is but a title, and may be but a convenient abbreviation for "The hierarchy of the Holy Roman Church ‡ in [not, of] the United

* It so reads in the Almanac for 1835, but in an Almanac for 1844 I cannot find it. Once, this would have surprised me, in a Church which is infallibly and always the same. But since I have discovered changes in the Bible even, under that Church's auspices, the thing seems quite natural.—As to changes in the Bible, let the following facts speak for themselves. There is a technical distinction made by Papists, between *adoration* and *worship*. We may *worship* images; but we may *adore* God only. Now the Rheims Testament of 1582 reads Hebrews xi. 21, unflinchingly, thus: "By faith, Jacob dying, blessed every one of the sons of Joseph; and adored the top of his rod." But the Rheims Testament of 1582, republished at Philadelphia in 1831, and under all possible authority, reads the same text thus: "By faith, Jacob when he was dying blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshipped the top of his rod." So much for one instance. Enough can be said about hundreds more, if it is wanted. And as to Latin Vulgates, sanctioned by Popes themselves, Mr. James in his "Corruptions" says the differences "amount to some thousands." See new edition of 1843, p. 195, note—However, all this is, I suppose, as it should be. It is but a legitimate illustration of Dr. Moehler's theory of "development."

† The later Almanac hardly mends the matter. It reads "Diocesses of the United States:" as if the government of the United States had dioceses; or there were no dioceses but their own. By the way, in a very, very small matter, Popery is here inflexible. It spells diocese in the old way, "diocess." No development for orthography yet, I suppose.

‡ I say "Roman Church," and not "Roman Catholic Church;" for

States." It were little to be cared for in other Almanacs; but here it means what it says. This is the legitimate style pontifical of a community, which absolutely and literally claims *the entire ecclesiastical jurisdiction* of this immense republican soil—nay, of the world itself; for the Pope is Christ's vicar for the terraqueous globe, and could give away continents as pertinently as ever. And, too, it is the style of a community, one of whose lordly "hierarchy" averred to a *young* friend of mine, susceptible of intimidation, but now safe in Paradise, that unless a man believed the wafer and wine of the mass were, as certainly and exactly, the flesh and the blood of his Saviour, as were the body which suffered on the cross and the blood which was shed from it, "HE COULD NOT BE SAVED!"

But I must conclude. Such things then can show, that while Popery, after its own fashion, had judgment without mercy, from its extreme in theory, and its cousin-german in temper, Puritanism—and that while that judgment was inflicted by the same pushing and elbowing disposition, which hustled all who dare tread on soil of which it claimed more than the entire ecclesiastical jurisdiction, viz., the entire property—that still, the votaries of Popery were, if any are, tolerably fair subjects for the experiments of intolerant selfishness. Alas! that there should be a system, in which frail, fallible mortals are actors and umpires, which claims jurisdiction over the living and the dead, through this world, and into that which is to come! And yet Papists anathematize us all without exception, who question the supremacy of a single bishop over the faith and worship of the globe—doom us all, unless "invincible ignorance"

even Pope Pius IV.'s Creed uses this appellation, as if sufficient, and the other involves a contradiction, so that I ordinarily eschew it. The Catholic Church is of no country. It is neither Roman, nor English, nor American. Its limit of comprehension is the world. And it is one of the grave solecisms of Popery, to claim it as if it belonged to Rome.

can save us,* (a hook on which no sure hope can hang,) to the penal fires of hell—will not grant the decencies of burial, to our poor impassive clay. O, if the Puritans had never been severe but upon such unearthly assumption, such undying hate, it would have been grating to have passed one censure on them. Sorry indeed am I to assign their proscription of those who proscribe earth and heaven to us, to the same dismal temper, which made them similar opponents of all who varied from that stern standard, which had the opinion of Puritan parsons and the vote of Puritan legislatures for its indestructible foundation.

LETTER XVII.

Agreeably to an intimation in my last letter, the present one will notice the bearings of the Puritans towards the Presbyterians.

'The bearings of the Puritans towards the Presbyterians!' some, at least, of my readers will exclaim. 'Are not the parties identically the same? We had always supposed there was no difference between the two; and that to talk of one as arrayed against the other, was like talking of Satan's being arrayed against himself.' As to the Satan-

* Tottie's Sermons, p. 338. Leslie's Works, i. 500; or iii. 87.—Bramhall's Works, new edit. i. 198. Milner's End of Controversy; in the conclusion. Milner lays down the Popish doctrine on this subject like a genuine partisan. Now and then, however, we are treated more mercifully. The Rev. James Archer, e. g. an author to whom Charles Butler, Esq., the opponent of Southey, was partial, will not allow the title *heretic* to be applied to us indiscriminately. See his Sermon on Persecution, page 11.

ical reference in this observation, a Quaker, or a Baptist, not to say an Episcopal reader, of a *full* history of the Westminster Assembly, might possibly think it not altogether inappropriate to either side; for the conflicts which that "Most Sacred Assembly"* witnessed, often wore a most unearthly aspect. And it may be affirmed, as an unquestionable fact, that Puritans and Presbyterians have not long been true yoke-fellows, any where. Their opposition began before the Assembly's days, and has not ceased still, in the view of those who understand their character thoroughly.

It is difficult to say, in precise terms, what sort of membership the genuine Presbyterians held in the Church of England; for membership they unquestionably did have in it, and in greater or less numbers, for no inconsiderable period of time. We have a word in politics which describes their position, the word "lobby-member;" but its use would be esteemed ungracious, and if I introduce it, I must be understood as doing so for definition's sake alone. Yet, it comes nearer to a precise description of their position, than any other at my command. They were seeking to mould the will of the Legislators in spiritual matters—were off and on—now obsequious in the hope of success, and now testy and rebellious from disappointment. Still, they never presumed to go so far in their hostility to the Church of England, as to say it was no church at all.

Not so was it with the Independents or Congregationalists, whom I regard as the real fathers of Puritanism, of such Puritanism, at least, as established and generated itself

* Right Reverend, &c., are horrible misnomers, when applied to Churchmen. Yet "Most Sacred" was not thought too lofty a style for anti-churchmen. Collier. viii. 257. In the same temper Baxter, in *that* edition of his Saints' Rest, published in Cromwell's days, said, "Parliament of Heaven" for "Kingdom of Heaven," and put Brook, Pym, &c. there. But he afterwards took them out again!—Long's Review of Baxter's Life, p. 41. See also Jones of Nayland's Works, v. 63.

in New England. They denounced the Church, as a mere anti-Christian hierarchy, which it was lawful for them, nay, a bounden duty for them, utterly to overturn.* Presbyterians, however, were often partial conformists, and continued to be such to a very late date. Collier, for example, tells us that in Charles the Second's time, *after* the Act of Uniformity, even their ministers did not hesitate, when they had finished their sermons to their own congregations, to attend at the Established Church, and commune there! † This is a most remarkable fact, and shows that many of them viewed their separation, as Wesley did his, as but partial or temporary.

But the out and out Puritan, the descendant of Robert Brown, called the Church of England, Babylon, Rome, &c., &c. And he thought the doom of Babylon in the Apocalypse,‡ to be cast like a great millstone into the sea, and to be sunk so deep as to be found no more at all, her just and appropriate due. And such were the Puritans with whom the Independents, or Congregationalists, of New England, the rather sympathized—after the grace of whose fashion they preferred to copy.§ They professed, it is quite true,

* See Ball's answer to John Canne, edit. 1642, Pt. i. p. 125, Pt. ii. 4, 5. Also Bartlet, who quotes *ex abundanti* the highest Puritan Independent authorities, is very plain in his declarations of the anti-Christianism of the Church of England, and admits its baptisms, (mark and remark this, my fellow-churchmen,) only on the principle of the validity of lay baptism!!!—Bartlet's Congregational Way. Lond. 1647, pp. 104, 105, 119, etc.

† Collier. ii. 89; or viii. 460.—Lathbury, pp. 355, 56.

‡ Rev. xviii. 21.

§ Even John Robinson, be it remembered, with all his boasted change for the better, would never allow *communion* with the Church of England. With what decency then can the Puritans complain, that we never receive the Eucharist at *their* hands?

And further, (for I may as well mention it here, perhaps, as any where,) this is a particular of Brownistic polity, from which "the New England divines" took strict care not to depart. It may be questioned whether, *in temper*, they have departed from it still. That they adhered to Robinson's utter

as Higginson and his companions did, not to adopt the rough language of separation, "Farewell Babylon, farewell Rome, &c." They indited a most deferential and affectionate epistle from the Arabella, addressed to "their brethren in and of the Church of England." But it is an adage, old and trite enough for a schoolboy, that actions speak louder than words. Their actions, as Hutchinson admits, (whom I have already quoted on this matter,) "left no room for doubt, after they arrived in America."* Then they soon developed their inward and fond conformity, to Brown's principles and platform.

This, indeed, has been denied, and is still denied, with stereotyped formality. But, it is asserted, and just as steadfastly, and that also by Presbyterian authority. Hetherington, the latest Presbyterian writer upon the subject, with whom I am acquainted, does not hesitate to declare, that "From this person [Brown] the first form of what has since been termed the Independent or Congregational system of Church government, appears to have had its origin; the great majority of the Puritans [i. e., moderate Puritans,]

disallowance of the Sacraments of the Church of England, and considered worship by its liturgical forms unlawful, is evident from their Answers to thirty-two Questions, &c.; a tract which will be alluded to before this this letter is done. See p. 28, where they absolutely *bewail* their ever having had any thing to do with the ordinances and rites of their "dear mother."—Can the posterity of these people, who once *bewailed* having had aught to do with the Church of England, and who still think that Church nothing but a stone-cold and stone-dead exemplification of Christianity, murmur with the smallest propriety if *we* let *their* ordinances entirely alone? The Puritans disallowed the Ordinations, the Sacraments, and the Liturgy, of the Church of England. Was there much left for them to disown? And now, forsooth, their posterity turn round and talk of the exclusiveness of Episcopalians! "Faith," said Richard III., "some certain dregs of conscience are yet within me." May the experience of the usurper be imparted to them, in their consideration of Churchmen; and then we and *our* exclusiveness can henceforth go free.

* Hutch. Hist. i. 24, 25.

either retaining their connection with the Church of England, in a species of constrained half-conformity, or associating on the Presbyterian model."* And he goes on to add, that "Brown not only renounced communion with the Church of England, but also with all others of the reformed churches, who would not adopt the model which he had constructed."† Now it is in this respect that Ross, another Presbyterian writer, says the Independents of New England imitated Brown, as has been shown by a former reference.‡ And, in fact, the object of all these letters is but an illustration of the same proposition.

Now Ross is an *old* writer, while Hetherington is a *late* one. The edition of Ross's book, from which I quote, is the fifth; and it bears the date of 1675. Of Hetherington, I quote the American edition of 1843. I could go higher, and quote the *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*, or, the Divine Right of Church Government, of the Presbyterians, of which the second edition of 1647 is before me.§ But it is not necessary: the oldest Presbyterian writers avowed and maintained the Brunonian paternity of Congregationalism, as well as Bishop Hall, or an Episcopalian of the nineteenth century.|| And, from them onward, down to our own

* Hist. West. Assembly, p. 46.

† How different the temper of Dr. Rainolds, of Hampton Court memory. He asked for absolution from a Churchman on his death-bed, and kissed the hand of him who pronounced it!—Fuller's Ch. Hist. iii. 231.

‡ Ross's Hist. all Rel. p. 390, 391.

§ Also the Presbyterian *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, or, Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry; of the edition of 1654. Pref. to Part ii.

|| The plain-speaking Mr. Edwards comes out with all his strength upon this subject; for he is provoked by the Jesuitical denials of the Independents. He says, all the water in the Thames will not wash away from them the imputation of Brownism. Antapologia, p. 197: also, pp. 136, and 296. Comp. Baillie's Dissuasive, pp. 102, 103, etc. Baillie's Anabaptists, p. 54.

times, the impressions of true Presbyterians have remained unchanged, respecting a point which Congregationalists never allow, but with the most parsimonious reluctance.*

It may be expected of me, however, to be more explicit in my proof of it. Accordingly I am willing to undertake for some, what they may consider better proof of the identity of New England Puritanism, and Brunonian Puritanism, or Independency; which was as thoroughly anti-Presbyterian, as it was anti-Episcopalian. This proof can be derived from the identity of their principles. And there are four principles, not to mention more, which strongly characterized Independency even under Brown's personal auspices—which characterized it when it obtruded its unwelcome presence in the Westminster Assembly, and which continued to characterize it on American shores, whither it had exiled itself to enjoy freedom and supremacy. These principles respect the following subjects, viz., the Church, Ordination, what may now as well be called Development as any thing, and Intolerance. It can easily be shown, how Brownism and Independency differed upon these topics from Presbyterianism; and a person of very limited acquaintance with modern ecclesiastical history, can determine for himself as I proceed, under my four particulars, whether the Congregationalists of New England have not proved themselves like the ancient Brownists, and are not, so far as "the spirit of the age" will admit, very like them still.

I. The Church.

Let us hear Mr. Hetherington's testimony as to the difference between Independents and Presbyterians concerning this subject. One would suppose, that a right view of the Church as a whole, as an institution, was, if not a fundamental, the next thing to it, at the lowest estimation.

* It used to cost a flogging, to call a Massachusetts Puritan a Brownist. If the libel, (libel if it were,) had not had a *terrible sting* in it, its author would have escaped the lash.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 81.

Nevertheless, he positively asserts, that "The point on which the GREATEST disagreement existed, was that relating to the ideas which they attached to the term Church."* The Independents held, that any seven persons, professing a belief in the Christian religion, and voluntarily associating together, were competent to any ecclesiastical act whatever.† They could elect and ordain their own clergymen, (a point which, for distinctness' sake, will come up separately,) and perform any act competent to be performed by a Synod or a General Council; and their action was absolute and final. In other words, these seven were a complete ecclesiastical sovereignty.‡ And it is so with genuine Congregationalism still; unless the principle is admitted in a yet more latitudinarian style. If I am not misinformed, *three*[118] can now do all which *seven* once could; so that upon Congregational principles any three Christians, voluntarily associating, are an ecclesiastical corporation which knows no superior beneath the sun.§ True, such a corporation hearkens to a council, or an association, or a consociation, or any thing else—to which it pleases. But all which it does in this way, is the condescension of majesty, and not a submission to right.

Now, a Presbyterian idea of the Church is so different from all this, that Mr. Hetherington is justified fully in

[118] See Note 118.

* Hist. West. Ass. 165. Compare Jus Div. Regiminis Ecclesiastici. Pref., pp. xiii, xiv.

† Walker's Hist. Independency, Pt. iii. p. 23.

‡ See P. Nye, on the oath of Supremacy, &c., vindicating Dissenters. London, reprinted 1683, p. 41, etc.

§ "In whom [Ministers and other church officers] they say church power is only executively, (as to the exercise or dispensation;) but it is primarily and eminently, in that Body of the people, *never so small*, which is so combined together."—Gauden's Hieraspistes, p. 98, London, 1653.

stating, that between it and the idea of the Independents, "the greatest disagreement" existed. The Presbyterian idea of the Church differs from the Episcopal in form, rather than essence; as the very title of the theological classics of 1647 and 1654 effectually demonstrate. "Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici, or, the Divine Right of Church Government," and "Jus Divinum Ministerii Ecclesiastici, or, the Divine Right of the Gospel Ministry," sound so much like the titles of genuine church-books, that a Churchman might easily mistake them for one written by Ap. Laud, in propria personâ. Still more would he be puzzled, if he turned to p. 264 of the first, and p. 32 of the second part, of the next, and found "a ministerial succession" vindicated, even if it came through Rome! Or looked into the Vindication, sometimes bound up with the first, and found Popish baptism pronounced valid, Timothy and Titus pronounced apostles, and the Eucharistic wine called "the blood of Christ sacramental."* Or, turned to p. 23 of the first part of the Min. Ecc., and found that Baptism "is called by the Holy Ghost, a saving ordinance." But, most of all, would the current of discourse gratify him, when he discovered all matters of discipline, all canons, decrees, and definitions of faith, committed to the judicatories of the Church, and officers not manufactured by the people. Surely, he would exclaim, 'The Christians who made this book differ heaven-wide from new-light Puritans, and from the Evangelical Congregationalists, so called, of our own times. For those

* See Vindication, &c., pp. 93, 143. Hubbard's N. Eng. 143. Presbyterians of the present day are wiser than their forefathers, for they have just decreed Romish baptism to be invalid. They are wiser too than the school of Richard Baxter Baxter in his Reformed Liturgy, (no objection to a liturgy, it seems, of *his own* making,) calls the elements of the Eucharist "no common bread and wine, but sacramentally the body and blood of Christ." He also calls Baptism, "this sacrament of regeneration." Alas for Baxter now!

new-lights were, (as their counterparts still are,) so devoted to their own inventions, in every particular, that they preferred singing their own hymns, to singing as near as may be the language of inspiration itself—a translation of David's Psalms!'

Now it is most remarkable, how, in so minute a matter as this, the old Puritan spirit, which considers itself *par excellence* evangelical, has been faithfully perpetuated. A passion for human hymns, in opposition to divine psalms, has labored to foist itself into other communions, so that even the Episcopal Church in this country, has had to fortify herself against it, by drawing up a rubric requiring God's own language to be sung! I say God's own language, meaning of course a translation of it; but then the Bible itself, that every body save a scholar uses, is nothing more. As if it would seem, there must of course be an opposition to almost every thing that claimed *a divine right*. And so also it appeared to the Presbyterians of old. A Presbyterian of the days of the Westminster Assembly distinctly complains of this strange Puritan passion for hymns, in opposition to psalms—hymns, he adds, "of their own making."*

Not to dwell too long on each of my four points, let us now come to the second.

II.—Ordination.

This the Presbyterian believed, (as the Churchman does,) to be no affair of the people; and talked, as we have seen, of a "ministerial succession," out of which he was not to be frightened even if it came through Rome.

Here, he and the genuine Puritan separated again, and totally. Such a Puritan renounced Episcopal ordination, not as a nullity only, but as a sin. I need not go over ground traversed in my eighth letter; but it may be well to

* Gangraena, Pt. i. p. 45. However, when the Puritans could sing psalms under *their own* auspices they did so: as Sir Edmund Andros discovered to his annoyance.

add, that this renunciation of an ordination not conferred by the people, began in the days of Queen Elizabeth,* and was well known in the days of the Commonwealth.† It was repeated in this country, and habitually. True, the Congregational laity are now disfranchised of their old rights, because a lay ordination appears undignified: it comes as it were from the shop, or the farm, and clerical self-consequence will not endure it. But when it was first *forbidden*, it was so treated by a fastidious and aristocratical officer of Harvard University, and was indignantly protested against as a "bill of exclusion."‡ This bold step was taken in 1696, and was infectious enough, notwithstanding its imitation of a "divine right" practice, to create and transmit a new custom. Dr. Holmes, in his Dudleian Lecture of 1810, in the same town of Cambridge, where the laity were first thrust away from ordinations, could safely enough say, that ordination "has been performed by apostles; by prophets and teachers; by evangelists; and by elders and presbyters; and by *none others*."§ Fortunately Deacon Gile, who denounced the "bill of exclusion" of 1696, had taken no care to keep up *his* succession; and Dr. Holmes's dogma was as safe as one of the definitions of Euclid.

After all, however, it may fairly be questioned, whether at the present day, clerical ordination among the Congregationalists is any thing more than an affair of courtesy or of taste. If a man were elected a minister by a Congregational Society, if any two or three of the so called church-members imposed hands upon him, and he then assumed all a Congregational minister's prerogatives, I could make a present of my own letters of orders to any association

* Soames's Elizabeth, p. 255. Note.—Lechford in his Plaine Dealing confirms this. Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 123.

† Baillie's Letters, &c., New Edition, ii. 148.

‡ Quincy's Harv. Univ. i. pp 89, 489.

§ Holmes's Dud. Lect. p. 7.

which would dare to pronounce him a mere layman, and beg to have them issued anew by such resolute authority.[119]

III.—Development.

By this I mean that Independency has always looked upon itself, as (to use the language of a geologist) in a transition-state, and prepared for any changes whatsoever.[120] And it avowed this peculiarity of itself, in almost the very face and eyes of the "Most Sacred Assembly," in its notorious "Apologeticall Narration." Its disciples wished the purpose of never making present judgment and practice a binding law for the future, enacted as the most sacred of all laws.* This is evidently the notion which Robinson had in view, in his farewell address to the Plymouth Pilgrims, when he told them to be ready for any novelties, since God had yet more truth to break forth out of his holy word.

That this was the flickering principle or policy of the early Independents is incontestable:† and that it was acted upon, and acted out, in New England, the history of Unitarianism there is an ample voucher. Nay, that Unitarianism is its legitimate result, has been contended for in a sermon by Mr. Charles W. Upham, delivered at Salem, Mass., November, 1826, called "Principles of the Reformation." Few Unitarians have written a better sustained sermon than this. How Calvinistic Congregationalists can upbraid him, or his sect, for their position, I know not. They are, as he proves most successfully, but carrying out the established law of Independency—indeed the most sacred of its laws. And Mr. Upham is as frank as he is ingenious. His forefathers were Calvinists; he and his are Socinians;

[119] See Note 119. [120] See Note 120.

* Hetherington, p. 160. Edwards' Antapologia, p. 85.

† Gauden's Hieraspistes, p. 452. This is one of the follies Gauden condemns. Walker's Independency, Pt. iii. p. 22.

and his posterity may be—just what they please.[121] Nay, if they come to conclusions different from his own, or from those of any higher predecessor, he solemnly charges "their contemporaries not to reproach them." (Sermon, p. 8.)

Now this is precisely as it should be. Independency was originally and professedly a Proteus,* and it has practically proved itself one; as Mr. Upham earnestly contends it may do, without fear and without reproach. Not to speak of the strides which a portion of its adherents have taken towards Socinianism, Humanitarianism, Transcendentalism, and I fear Pantheism, [for the late Prof. Ware had to preach a sermon before Harvard University, to prove the personality of God !]† it might be asked what are the remaining and the more considerate portions doing? Mr. Newton's speech, quoted in my fifth letter, shows that the Cambridge Platform has waxed old, and is ready to vanish away. Has the Saybrook Platform fared better? Would the majority of the Congregational ministers in Connecticut adopt it as their

[121] See Note 121.

* Baillie speaks decidedly of its "most slie and cunning way," and that it was the "mother and true fountaine of all the church-distractions" of England. Notwithstanding, Baillie, though promoted by Charles II. after the Restoration, continued a sturdy old Presbyterian to the last; and would not so much as give a bishop his titles by courtesy.—Baillie's Letters, &c., *new edit.* of 1841, 1842, ii. 130, 216; and iii. 487.—My references to Baillie's Letters, it may be well enough to say, are almost all of them to the edition of 1775. I had not the new in time.

† This was delivered September 23, 1838; and, though one of a course of sermons, was deemed necessary for immediate publication. It might well fail of all effect, however, for it admits that "express infidelity is not vice," and "atheism is not immorality." (See p. 22.) These are strange assertions for a Christian to convert infidels and atheists with. They remind one of what Bp. Horsley told Dr. Priestley, that his way of converting unbelievers resembled that of the Jesuit, who taught his savages our Saviour was a great *cacique*, who in three years scalped men, women, and children without number; and thereby made plenty of converts forthwith !—See Horsley's Tracts, 3d edit. p. 298.

creed? Let semi-pelagian Taylorism answer. Or let an *ex animo* consent to the language of the consecrating prayer of our Communion Service, which calls the atonement "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and SATISFACTION, for the sins of the whole world"—be applied as a test to candidates for Congregational ordination; and the man who will not wince under it, would deserve the mark of an angel, as one that sighs and cries for the abominations of Jerusalem.*

But Presbyterianism, when genuine, believes in no developments. It understands not the Jesuitical art of adopting a creed for substance, and denying any of its disagreeable particulars. Like Episcopacy, (see the Preface of the English Prayer Book to the XXXIX Articles,) it would have its adherent submit to its Confessions of Faith "in the plain and full meaning thereof," and would not allow him to "put his own sense or comment, to be the meaning of the Article," but require him to "take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

It may be said, indeed it is said, that by departing from the strictness of its own standards, Presbyterianism in this country has riven itself in twain. But that only convinces its less Puritanic half, (the old school party,) of their sad mistake in allowing the development and creed-depreciating tendency of Congregationalism to be mingled with its own elements, till they produced an absolute explosion. It is Puritanism in the shape of Independency, which has wrought mischief in the Presbyterian General Assembly in this country; as it wrought mischief in the Assembly at Westminster, two hundred years ago. It gave that Assembly the severest blow it received from any hand whatever.†—

* Ezekiel ix. 4.

† Walker's Independency, Pt. i. p. 27.—Aiton's life of Henderson, pp. 526, 527.—Hunter's Life of Heywood, pp. 107, 108.—Edwards' Antapologia, p. 269.

It has given Presbyterianism in this country the unkindest cut of all. Many weakly and ignorantly suppose, that Puritanism and Presbyterianism are identical. They have yet to learn, and perhaps to their own cost, that genuine Presbyterianism has not had a deadlier foe. Nor is that foe yet put effectually at a distance, by geographical divisions. He has left a sting behind. Already in the old school party has the question occasioned fierce debates, whether ruling elders should not impose hands in ordination. Here is the virus of Independency, creating a new sore spot—an abscess will be the consequence; and Presbyterianism will have to divide again, to try to let the matter out. Alas, it has entered its protest against Puritanic Independency too late! The law of change with which this system started, falls in quite too harmoniously with "the spirit of the age;" and that law will now be inflicted on Presbyterianism without mercy, till it is shred into sectarian patches.

These remarks accord too well with my fourth topic, not to make me think it is time to bring that up formally. I therefore introduce it.

IV. Intolerance.

And by this I mean Independency's intolerance towards Presbyterianism, and its efforts to extinguish it. But that idea will, to many, be a perfect puzzle. What! Puritanism persecuting Presbyterianism? There is some strange misnomer here—this language is a mere blind paradox. And yet the idea conveyed by it has virtually been before my readers, in remarks under the topic now concluded; and if I again adduce it, I do so but to impress it, if possible, more deeply, knowing how some will revolt at it, and how others try to sneer it off, or laugh it down. But the provoking truth is necessary, and it must stand out in all its plainness: for its ugliness I am not responsible. Puritans of the straitest sect, then, have persecuted Presbyterians unmer-

cifully;* and a bitterer feeling has existed between these parties, than between Presbyterians and Churchmen. This sort of Puritans are characterized in the dedication of King James's Bible, as "self-conceited brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their own anvil." Presbyterians found them such, as well as Churchmen; and now for the proof of my assertion.

It is quite true, that when they were at the outset of their career, the Puritan Independents felt weak, and tried to gain strength, by keeping their more powerful neighbors, the Puritan Presbyterians, at bay with the catch-words, "toleration," and "liberty to tender consciences." Then they complained of the Presbyterians, as earnestly as Presbyterians ever did of Prelatists. Hear the lugubrious wail of Thomas Goodwin, one of the most celebrated of his party, and, in Cromwell's day, President of Magdalen College, Oxford.† "They do worse than all this; for when they have joined with the world, they make use of worldly force and compulsion, and employ and call in aid and strength from the world, whereby to compel their poor Dissenting Brethren to their way." The term "Dissenting Brethren," my readers should understand, was a term which was then applied censoriously, by the Presbyterians to the Independents; who were looked upon, we shall presently see, as schismatics. Goodwin has much more to the same effect, in that one of his voluminous treatises quoted, and which is necessarily passed by. Suffice it to say, he is very severe, and tells the Presbyterians that they have less forbear-

* Dissenter Disarmed, Pt. i. 161. London, 1681.

† Compare Johnson's wail of "so many [Presbyterian] books, to prove the Congregational or Independent churches to be the sluice through which so many floods of error flow in."—Mass. Coll. 2d series, vii. 2.

ance for the Independents, than *men of the world have for one another.**

But how was it when the wheel of fortune rolled over, and the lower spoke became the uppermost—when Thomas Goodwin, *e. g.*, was established as Cromwell's favorite, and basked in the sunshine of a tyrant's greatness?

Now we can hear the other side, and let them speak.—"They were thus led," says Hetherington, "to advocate a toleration in theory, which they never granted when their own power was predominant, as in New England—and which, it may be added, they never would consent to grant to the Presbyterians; whom they would not admit to communion with them, unless they were willing to abandon Presbyterianism and become Congregationalists."† "A sect had lately sprung up," writes Mr. Tytler, "who termed themselves Independents. They held the Presbyterians in as great abhorrence, as those of the Church of England."‡ And now for a wail from the oppressed, to correspond to Dr. Goodwin's. "The Greek word for schism," write the Presbyterians to the Independents, under the sanction of a Provincial Assembly, "signifies rending, and sure it is that you rend yourselves from us, and not *as from Churches of the same rule*,§ but *as Churches differing in the rule*, with a dislike of us, and a protestation that you cannot join with us, as fixed members, without sin."|| You hear us preach not as persons in office, but as gifted men only; [Note this, O ye Episcopal bigots!] and some of you refuse to

* T. Goodwin's Works, vol iv. Gov't of the Church, p. 406. See also Neal referred to for the same purpose, by Lathbury, p. 195. Lilly's Life and Times, new edit. pp. 128, 135, 190.

† Hetherington, p. 168.—Compare the Dissenter Disarmed, Pt. ii. 184, 185.

‡ Tytler's Hist. ii. 406. § These Italics are not mine.

|| Baillie, one of the most zealous of the Presbyterians, retorts upon them their favorite censure, and says nobody had a good opinion of their piety.—Letters, i. 438.

hear us preach at all. You renounce all church-communion with us as members; and, not only so, but you invite our people from us, by telling them *that they cannot continue with us without sin.*"* Edwards, in his celebrated Gangraena, uses even stronger language; and shows that the Presbyterians were called papistical and anti-christian, as well as Episcopalians! This, according to him, is one of the positions of the uprising faction, which was trying to tread Presbyterianism in the dust: "That the Presbytery and the Presbyteriall Government are the false prophet, and the beast spoken of in the Revelations. Presbytery is a third part of the city of Rome; yea, that beast in Rev. xi. that ascends, and shall kill the two witnesses, viz., THE INDEPENDENTS."† In this way, by assuming to themselves a divine mission, and representing themselves as likely to suffer martyrdom, for their fidelity in denouncing papistic Presbyterianism, the Puritanic Independents calculated upon inflaming the prejudices and passions of the multitude.—And they succeeded. The sun of Presbyterianism went down in clouds. It set hopelessly. It has never risen in brightness; for, as Dr. Buchanan assures us, all the old Presbyterian societies in England are now Socinian without exception.‡

It is not to be supposed that Presbyterianism sunk without a desperate struggle. It did not. But the Independents secured the army,§ and, by the "holy text of pike and gun," proved their doctrine at least valiantly and prevailingly orthodox. The Presbyterians were peculiarly unfortunate. Even their patriotism was held cheap. They fomented rebellion against the King, under the patronage of the Scotch,

* Vindic. Presbyt. Government, &c., 1649, pp. 130, 131. Edwards' Antapologia, pp. 199, 200.

† Gangraena, Pt. i. 28. ‡ Buchanan's Researches, 11th edit. p. 120.

§ Hetherington calls the strife between the Presbyterians and Independents, "a conflict of principle against intrigue and power," p. 195.

and the Solemn League and Covenant. And when the Independents outgeneralled them by intrigue, and the King was put to death, they tried to rouse a faint cry of loyalty, by professing horror at the execution. But their sincerity was distrusted: it came too late, and it availed them nothing. Dean Swift speaks a general sentiment, when he says, "As to what is alleged, that some of the Presbyterians declared openly against the King's murder, I allow it to be true. But from what motives? No other can possibly be assigned, than perfect spite, rage, and envy, to find themselves wormed out of all power, by a new infant spawn of Independents, sprung from their own bowels."*

All this goes to show, and does show, that the alienation between the Presbyterians and the Independents became, at last, even furiously bitter.[122] "Acerrima ferme proximorum odia sunt," says the philosophical historian of Rome; and they exemplified it to a tittle. Edwards, the Presbyterian, can even compliment Churchmen at the expense of Independents; while they, on the other hand, not only loved Churchmen, if not Papists, far better than they did the Presbyterians, but preferred before them even the scouted Anabaptist.† The climax of mutual abuse was reached, by calling each other Papist and Jesuit: the toughest ecclesiastical nicknames of that day, or of any other. We have seen, already, how Presbyterianism was compared to the Babylonish adulteress in the Revelations; and I may now add, to complete the picture, that the Presbyterians took special pains to show the similarity between the Puritan Independent, and the crafty, reckless Jesuit.

[122] See Note 122.

---

* Swift's Presbyterian plea of merit; or, in my copy of his Works, xiii. 112.—Compare the Dissenter Disarmed, Pt. ii. p. 106.

† Antapologia, p. 279. Gangraena, Pt. i. 44. Vindic. Pres. Govt. p. 137. Baillie's Dissuasive, p. 106.

Edwards musters and marshals seven potent reasons to establish the likeness; and not content with that, he gives his schismatical neighbors a parting lunge, such as Ehud gave Eglon, and says they outstrip Machiavel himself.*

Such complimenting as this, will no doubt be excused, on account of the "spirit of the age;" but it is *yet* believed all pertinent and true, when applied by Presbyterians or Independents to Episcopalians. By what mysterious revolution has it suddenly grown false and meaningless, when Presbyterians and Independents apply it to one another?†

And now, at length, may I not say, that this review of some of the chief differences between Puritanic Presbyterians, and the still more Puritanic Independents—differences in principle, resulting in utter alienation in point of fact—that this review excuses my going, as it was thought might be necessary, into a regular historical sketch of the controversy, between these ever-famous dissentients from one another? I expected, indeed, to have to trace the *purer* Puritanism, from its rise in the reign of Elizabeth, to its vigorous maturity in the days of Cromwell, when virtually it wielded a sceptre. I expected to have to present a view of the caustic "Apologeticall Narration"—the great Congregational manifesto—which Hetherington styles a declaration of war ‡—to

* Edwards' Gangraena, Pt. i. 40; Pt. iii. 150.—Judges, iii. 21. And a New Englander thus paid him back, in speaking of the Presbyterians,

There is a sett of Bishops coming next behind,
Will ride the Devil off his legs, and break his wind.

† See Simple Cobbler of Agawam, p. 37. Dissenter Disarmed, Pt. i. pp. 162, 163. Roger Williams, speaking of Rhode Island's comforts in 1653, thus chastises both Presbyterian and Independent. "We have not felt the new claims of the Presbyterian tyrants, nor been consumed by the over-zealous fire of those, called godly magistrates."—Mass. H. Coll. 2d ser. ix. 195.

‡ Hetherington, p. 163. Baillie, also, speaks of it in similar terms. See his Letters, &c., i. 420, 421. He also lets out an amusing piece of *secret* history. The *same* day the Independents offered the Narration,

follow out the Independents, in their intrigues with the Parliament and the army *—to show, too, how artfully they pressed talent, as well as power, into their service; inducing even Milton to abuse Presbyterians with all his might †—[Is that, Mr. Bacon, one of your reasons for commending his Puritanism?]—and finally, to show how they had raised up a host of Presbyterian authors, such as Rutherford, and Case, and Cawdrey, and Calamy, and Seaman, and Gataker, and Palmer, and Edwards, and Baillie, and Love, and John Vicars,‡ and Clement Walker, and even William Prynne and John Bastwick, after prelacy had cut their ears off;—who have showered on Puritanism, of the strictest kind, a perfect tempest of hailstones.

It may be, that I shall yet have to avail myself of these redoubtable Presbyterian scribes, and that the draught of Puritanism, by a Presbyterian graving-tool, is not yet sufficiently executed in *alto relievo*. Well, if so, I must be reconciled to my fate; but for the present shall content myself with saying, that I look upon two in the above list, as genuine Presbyterian martyrs—martyrs by Puritan hands! What, what, do you say, our "Dissenting Brethren" will ask—do our eyes tell true, or must we wipe our spectacles? Have Puritans ever martyred Presbyterians? Yes, I do verily and conscientiously believe so. Christopher Love was a Presbyterian divine, who felt some compunction when he saw Puritanism bestriding the nation like a Colossus. He endeavored to have the old government restored, and was

they made "a very great feast" for the Presbyterians; to see if they could not get them to *wash* it down. But it was a complete choke-pear: so they lost their labor, wine, money, and all.

* Hetherington, 118, 132.

† Brook's Religious Liberty, i. 488. Milton's Poems. Boston, vol. ii. 342, 343. Milton's Prose Works, in one vol. p. 103.

‡ Wood's Ath. Oxonienses, ii. 153. I give a reference to Vicars, as I suppose him less known than the rest. Five of the list given, Bartlet calls dirt-throwers.—Cong. Way, p. 115.

made a head shorter for it.* Love died, proclaiming himself a *martyr* with his latest breath.† Clement Walker wrote[128] the sharpest history of Puritanism, which, perhaps, it ever received. It cost him his life. He was thrown into a dungeon, and left to die, as he did die, a lingering death.‡ And so Puritanism, which spares not the Churchman, nor the Quaker, nor the Baptist, nor the Papist, nor any sectary from itself whatever, spares even the Presbyterian with no more reluctance, but takes his very blood, if necessary, to glut its revenge or to batten its ambition. This may be called strong language; but, it must be remembered, that it is used after returning from Presbyterian pages, and that it would have been stronger still, if I had drank more deeply of a Presbyterian spirit. Let these two sentences of Mr. Hetherington be my attestation: "From that time, forward, the contest between the Independents and the Presbyterians became one of irreconcilable rivalry; to which the utter defeat of the one or the other, was the only possible termination. And historical truth compels us to say, that, as this bitter warfare was begun by the Independents, they are justly chargeable with all the consequences of the fatal feud."§ Mr. Hetherington is a modern, and his language follows that of Edwards and his contemporaries, *haud passibus æquis*. Yet the words "rivalry," "warfare," and "feud," fall from his pen as naturally as life; and he quali-

[123] See Note, 123.

* Calamy's Baxter, i. 66. Brooks' Religious Liberty, i. 498. Of course it will be *said* that Love died for his treason, and not for his doctrine, as old Anthony Wood remarked, long ago.—Oxonienses, ii. 137.

† Neal, iv. 75.

‡ Wood's Ath. Oxonienses, ii. 145. Speaking of his perishing in his dungeon, Wood says, "He gave way to fate there, to the great grief of the Presbyterian party."

§ Hetherington, pp. 157, 158,

fies them with the austere adjectives, "irreconcilable," "bitter," and "fatal," without the shadow of a compunction.

Let this suffice, then, to disabuse uninformed minds, about the bearings of Puritanism towards Presbyterianism in England. Come we now to see, in a shorter compass, if possible, something of its bearings towards it on these shores, peopled by exiles for freedom.

It may easily be supposed, that as there were mixed up among the elements of opposition to the Establishment, what may be called high-church and low-church Puritans, that the same compound might be found among the early emigrants to New England. Such was the fact. The only difference was, that the low-church Puritans, or the Independents,* emigrated first; as the high-church Puritans, or Prebyterians, had better prospects for success, as matters lay at that period, and could better afford to stay at home. But then, as was natural, these low-church Puritans in New England, finding themselves *here* at the head of affairs, (like a low-churchman when made a bishop,) turned a somerset, and came up high-churchmen of the tallest sort. Now then, there was no doctrine, discipline, or worship, that was right, that could possibly be right, but theirs. Presbyterianism became, forthwith, a rival *beneath* them, struggling upward for their ascendency; and accordingly it must be frowned down. It was so treated, at a very early date in the history of Massachusetts. This is distinctly the testimony of Hutchinson. "Several persons who came from England in 1643, made a muster to set up Presbyterian government, under the authority of the Assembly at Westminster; but a New England assembly, the General Court, soon put them to the

* Or "Brownistical Independents," as Cotton Mather calls them. So here is one of themselves, and a classic, admitting what is so often and so testily denied—the connexion between Brownism and Congregationalism.—Magnalia, ii. 426.

rout."* No doubt this language describes, with graphic exactness, the amount of charity and ceremony with which these pioneers of Presbyterianism were greeted. Congregationalism, by this time, had made up its mind what the development of itself, for the latitude of Massachusetts, was designed to be. It was growing warm in its nest, feeling domesticated and at ease; and therefore pushed Presbyterianism out of doors, with as small compunction as political partisans hustle one another out of office.†

To some it may appear singular, that this disposition towards Presbyterianism did not appear when Roger Williams avowed his suspicions of ministerial caucuses, several years before. Roger was afraid they would end in presbyteries, and denounced them. Still, he found no favor. How can these things be? Ah! Roger was too sincere and simple-hearted. He really objected to clerical assemblages, on the ground of principle. But such assemblages, if they could, as they did do and were designed to do, upbuild Independency in Massachusetts, and give it there supremacy, were all right enough. He had not the wit to understand this; and so, anti-presbyterian though he might be, he was banished forever.

Afterwards, when Congregationalism was the Establishment of Massachusetts, he who disfavored Presbyterianism was just the agent which it wanted, and was enlisted for that warfare, which soon ended in the utter "rout" of the interlopers, who talked of synods and ruling elders, and a lordship above the congregation, to which there might be an appeal from the mischiefs of popular votes

* Hutchinson, i. 112. Felt's Salem, pp. 160, 161.—They made surer work than their friends in England, who had left Presbyterianism "gasping." They killed it without ceremony.—Dugdale, p. 243. Sav. Wint. ii. 77, note.

† "In all New England," says Baillie, in April 1644, "no liberty of living for a Presbyterian."—Letters and Journals, ii. 4.

Yes, Puritanism drave Presbyterianism from the judgment-seat, as recklessly as Gallio did the Jews. Nor so only; but when remonstrances came over from England, from its old friends and associates, against its high-handedness in setting up for itself as supreme, it had a firm and a ready answer. Such a remonstrance seems to have come, in the name of "divers ministers in England," and in particular of one Master Bernard, "minister of Batrombe."* It came in the shape of two-and-thirty questions, thirteen objections, and nine positions; a somewhat heavy dose, one might suppose, and which occasioned a few fits of indigestion. Nevertheless it was finally all got through with, and due return made, in the shape of three pamphlets, one for each batch of ingredients making the entire bolus, and which cover, in the small quarto of the times, 162 well-stuffed pages.

Of course I cannot bestow comments on the fiftieth part of them. Nor is it needful. It is quite enough if I can point out the marks of exclusiveness in them, and show that they gave semi-Puritan brethren in England no quarter. And this can be done in a very brief space. "Christ," says the first pamphlet, which may stand as a specimen for the rest, "hath left but one way for all churches, and the same to be observed to the world's end." (p. 82) "And as for acknowledging a company to be a sister church, that shall set up and practice another form of church-discipline, being otherwise in some measure as you say approvable, we conceive the company that shall so do shall not be approvable therein.† For the discipline appointed by Jesus Christ for

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. ix. 16, note. Or, Richard Bernard, Rector of Batcomb; see Wood's Ath. Oxon. ii. 689.

† This and the rest compares with the Apologetical Narration, which *in words* acknowledged the Presbytertan Church of England as a true church; and for the insincerity of which words, Mr. Edwards, the Presbyterian scourged it sorely.—Antapologia, p. 44, etc.

his churches, is not arbitrary, that one church may set up and practice one form, and another another form, as each one shall please; but is one and the same for all churches." "Again, if that discipline which we here practice, be, (as we are persuaded of it,) the same which Christ hath appointed, and therefore unalterable, we see not how another can be lawful." "We think if you were here, we should gladly accept of you and your people as a sister church, and that you would do the like to ours; *and yet not when you should set up and practice one form of church discipline, and we another.*" (pp. 83, 84.)*

This language, which was used in 1639 and 1640, part of it sanctioned directly by Hugh Peters, (whom Edwards calls "the Vicar General and Metropolitan of the Independents both in New and Old England,"†) and all of it uttered, no doubt, under the nod of Master Cotton, told Presbyterians, in terms sufficiently plain, what they were to expect, if they ventured to descend upon the coasts of New England. There was but *one* right way of church discipline. That right way was already there; and no other must intrude itself, but at the hazard of stern expulsion. Nevertheless, Presbyterianism growing stronger and more confident in England, in 1643, when the "Most Sacred Assembly," (that "Parliament of Heaven" below,) began its sessions, the attempt was actually made. But Congregationalism was as good as its word of warning. Its rival was routed from the land.‡

Nor did that satisfy. Having received an intrusive visit from Presbyterianism, the Congregationalists of New Eng

* Here is the Divine right system, plain as noonday. Yet Congregationalists of the present age give it all up.—Congregational Catechism, p. 82.—But if they have no Divine right to stay where they are—then why stay there?

† Gangraena, Pt. iii. p. 50.

‡ Mr. Savage is candid enough to admit, that Presbyterianism was "at least as offensive" to the New England Puritans as Episcopacy. Sav. Wint. ii. 77, Note.

land thought themselves authorized, agreeably to that pleasant law, *Lex Talionis*, to return the call. And they resolved to do so. Accordingly we find Master Cotton, in 1645, uttering *his* system of church-polity, and sending it over to London to be printed there, for the benefit of Independency, and the subversion, in due time, of Presbyterianism.* This may seem a somewhat hazardous declaration; but I do not fear to make it, with the Preface to Cotton's book now open before me, and which was written by some of the Independent party in England. This preface shows, how well the Independents understood polemical tactics. It alludes to no less than *seven* successive publications, aimed to insinuate their views into the minds of the community; of which Cotton's, the last, contains "a fuller declaration of all our way." That is, after having given you leaves and buds, we here give you the expanded blossom. And the Preface, (hardly by intention, but to make an impression against the Presbyterians, who had very foolishly attempted to control the press by a censorship,) lets out even more truth than this. It absolutely admits, that no sort of toil or chicanery were spared, to hurry these publications through the religious *cordon sanitaire*, by which Presbyterianism had surrounded itself. "Yet," it says, "with much sweat and wiles, some messengers have got through that Court of Guard."†

* "The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England," etc. London, 1645, pp. 116, quarto. New England kept Old England well supplied with her wares. She sent over Hugh Peters, Hibbins, and Weld, or Wells, in 1641, (Chalmers' Annals, 172;) and the Brownists' Conventicle, p. 5, published the same year, speaks of Samuel Eaton and others, as about as profitable an importation. Weld, or Wells, is the man who went to discomfort Ap. Laud in his imprisonment.—Laud's Troubles, pp. 213, 214.

† Alluding to a Presbyterian censorship of the press. This was a terrible thing for Laud to establish. Yet the Presbyterians soon had one themselves; and, by and by, the Puritans in New England followed suit. Then, suddenly, it became all right.

Altogether, the book and its preface is a most precious specimen of the temper of the times. Here is New England Puritanism, goaded itself a year or two before by Presbyterianism, now attempting retaliation, or self-defence, some no doubt will call it—i. e. upon the principles of the Romans, who drove away Hannibal by attacking Carthage. And here is the same system in England, coolly admitting that no labor or trickery was esteemed a sacrifice, or an immorality, so that this scheme of retaliation might be carried into effect, and Presbyterianism be worn out and trodden down, by one squadron after another of assailants.

Still, with such plain authorities before me, many, probably, will call all this a huge extravagance, and say that Puritanism in the shape of Independency, never did have, and never could have had, that intense hatred of Presbyterianism, which these statements ascribe to it. To such, I say, there is proof that the same hatred was even perpetuated; and, too, in an age when toleration was universal, appears to have lost not one atom of its sharpness. And the proof is at hand. I quote a book, the *first* edition of which appeared so late as 1778, and which was so unboundedly popular with English Dissenters, that it was endorsed by a synod, and ran through *five* editions in four years. The quotation is supplied me by the "Churchman Armed." "Popery," says the great oracle of modern non-conformity, "is the consummation of religious tyranny, and Presbyterianism a weak degree of it. But the latter [Presbyterianism] has in it the essence of the former [Popery], and differs from it [Presbyterianism differs from Popery] only as a kept mistress differs from a street-walking prostitute, or as a musket differs from a cannon."* The coarseness and virulence of this language are not surpassed by Hugh Peters, or Peter Sterry.† And yet, this is

* Churchman Armed, i. 445.

† See Baillie's opinion of Peters, Sterry, &c.—Letters, &c., new edit. iii. 443.

a tirade against Presbyterianism, perfectly lawful, even in our day, for Puritanism to give vent to. Alas, if these are the relics of its spleen against its ancient enemy, how relentless must its opposition have been, in the days of fresher and more open strife!

Such, then, were the bearings of Puritanism towards Presbyterianism, when they came in contact on American soil. It would not be difficult, though it might be tedious, to trace the history of them in detail, in after years. Probably this will not be expected; and *notitiæ*, after so fair a development at the outset, will be deemed sufficient.

I find, then, that Thomas Hooker and others labored hard to counteract Presbyterianism, as well as Cotton;* and that Shepard, who complained of Ap. Laud's "extreme malice and secret venom," was himself complained of by an English Presbyterian, as striving to infuse his own malice and venom, upon the subject of persecution, into the Westminster Assembly.† I find, as already stated, (but the fact is too important to leave out of this series,) that the General Court of Massachusetts carried on the same vile game, by sending three agents to England, in 1641, viz., Hibbins, Weld, and Hugh Peters; whose mission was "to promote the interest of reformation, by stirring up the war, and driving it on."‡ I find Cotton Mather himself, putting down among his *Ecclesiarum Prælia*, contests, and fierce ones, between those inclined to Presbyterianism and those inclined to Independency.§ True, Mr. Noah Hobart, in his controversy with Mr. Beach the Episcopalian, denies this fact;‖ and, what is not a little singular, on Mather's own authority. Leaving Mather out of the account, (since

* Sav. Winthrop, ii. 248. Felt's Salem, p. 173.

† Edwards' Gangraena, Pt. i. pp. 9, 10.

‡ Chalmer's Revolt of the Colonies, i. 84. Chalmers' Annals, p. 172. Sav. Wint. ii. 25, 212. Hutch. Hist. i. 95.

§ Magnalia, ii. 426. ‖ Hobart's Sec. Address, p. 96.

Mr. Savage will not trust him freely,)* other authorities are at hand, to set at naught an assertion, which Hobart's pride provoked him to make, and his bigotry to think true.† But to let such contradictions pass, I find Mather quoting his father, and his father quoting President Oakes, (all showing the true succession,) to prove that for Independents to adopt Presbyterianism, would be a "sad issue," nay, no less than sad degeneracy."‡ I find the same author vituperating two of the ablest Presbyterian writers against Puritan Independency, most cordially—calling one a scandalous inflicter of most horrid injuries, and the other a most unchristian and bespattering reviler.§ I find Peter Hobart, (the ancestor of John Henry Hobart, dreaded for that detestation of Puritanical tyranny in the brethren, which finally developed itself in the churchmanship of his descendant,) prohibited even from preaching, where his plainness might expose some of the weak points of Independency.|| I find lay-ordination, or the preaching of "gifted brethren," without any ordination whatever, encouraged—all of which is censured severely in the Presbyterian classics, Jus Divinum Regiminis ecclesiastici, and Jus Divinum Ministerii ecclesiastici. I find men who appealed to a Puritan legislature, in behalf of Presbyterians in 1646, meeting with a most summary denial, and made to smart with fines. I find the Presbyterian Huguenots, forbidden the privilege of erecting a house of public worship in the city of Boston.¶ I find Dr. Colman's society, (after the classic style already alluded to, imitating Peters and Sterry,) called "a Presbyterian brat;"** though it is believed that

* Sav. Wint. ii. 231.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. ix. 48, 2d ser. iv. 118–129.

‡ Magnalia, ii. 64, 65. § Ibid. i. 234, 4, 5.

|| Tudor's Otis, p. 497. Young's Chronicles, p. 402. Lincoln's Hingham, p. 79. ¶ Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. ii. 63.

** Colman had to go to England for Presbyterian orders; as it was feared the Bostonian Puritans would oppose him!!—Snow's Boston, pp. 202, 203.

they made it continue always a brat, and never allowed it to grow to manhood.* I find the Scottish and Genevan models carefully avoided in the construction of formularies of faith.† I find a controversy set on foot to exclude Presbyterianism from Massachusetts, as late as 1705; even after a sort of peace had been patched up between the Independents and Presbyterians in England in 1690, and their concordat adopted for all it was worth in the colony of Connecticut.‡ I find a Presbyterian house of worship assaulted at dead of night—and by a mob composed of the most respectable inhabitants of a Puritan town—levelled with the ground, and its occupants obliged to flee for protection into a neighboring State—and all this as far down as 1720.§ I find Presbyterians attacked even with firearms, and their petitions answered with "mingled subtlety and illiberality."|| And even down to the very late date of 1783, when this country had been severed from England, I find such efforts made in Massachusetts to convert a Presbyterian Society into a Congregational one, as to draw from a Presbytery the awful sentence of excommunication upon all who joined in them—not less than twenty persons. Surely there must have been something very pernicious, and very wrong, in the treatment of Presbyterianism by Puritanism, up to the times which border upon our own, to provoke its wrath so sorely!¶

And at last the question came up before me, Can I not put my finger on something which displays the belligerent aspect of Puritanism and Presbyterianism, in the times amid

* Douglass' Summary, ii. 149. Eliot's Biog. Dict. p. 125. Turell's Life of Colman, pp. 96, 125.

† Douglass' Sum. i. 440.

‡ See Wise's "Churches' Quarrel Espoused."

§ See Lincoln's Hist. of Worcester, where this shameful violence occurred, pp. 47, 191.

|| Lincoln's Worcester, pp. 48, 192, &c.

¶ Felt's Salem, pp. 519, 520.

which we actually live? If, thought I, the testimony I want cannot be found in the cross-fire of the Theological Review, published at New-York until 1839, and the Christian Spectator, published in New Haven, Connecticut, then, as a New-Englander would say, I make a strange guess indeed. To that review I went, and, in one of its latest numbers,* discovered a criticism upon a volume which has not escaped some comments of my own—the Historical Discourses of Mr. Leonard Bacon. And before the second page was finished, I found Mr. Bacon's motives routed from their lurking places, as successfully as the perhaps half-jesuitical schemes of the Presbyterians, in 1643. "Whatever other motives induced him to write the book, that one chief end of it is to subserve the interests of the theological party, with which he fraternizes, [i. e., the modern Puritanical,] and disparage their opponents, [old-fashioned Presbyterians, and all who resemble them in doctrine,] is too apparent to admit of disguise."

Now for another extract, to see who praises the Puritans of New England, and how little love is lost between the old litigants; and in fact, how the breach has rather widened—covering broad differences as to *doctrine*, while anciently it respected *discipline* almost altogether.

"To laud our Pilgrim Fathers is so congenial to the prevailing sentiments and feelings of the better portion of New England people, that they lack not eulogists of all grades. It has been a marvel with some, that the frequency and ardor of this panegyric, seem to be nearly in *the ratio of departure from their religious principles;* in other words, that the men who would most heartily disrelish and oppose one, who should now appear teaching those religious opinions which they taught, and in the faith of which they lived and died, should be most loud and abundant of all in their

* Literary and Theol. Review vi. 166.

praises of these same Puritans. We know of no class who have carried it so far, as the Unitarians of Massachusetts.* And with all their horror of antiquity and 'retrospective views,' we think the New School party in the country, rank next in their exuberant eulogies of the 'Puritans,' and the 'primitive New England spirit.' Whether they hope thus to lull the apprehensions of the public, in regard to any departure from New England's primitive faith, it is not for us to say."

Now, had some luckless Churchman, (myself for example,) expressed himself in this free and rasping style, it would have been considered, according to the course of nature—a modern outburst of the old "Laudean persecution." But it is a Presbyterian, *par excellence*, who writes thus. And do you think a Churchman only could match him, my suspicious reader? Behold he surpasses himself. Where will you find purer nitric acid, than in the following sentences, wound up with such a formidable application of one of the most terrific rebukes of Scripture? "It is ever true of mankind, that if their reverence for eminent departed saints respects their persons merely, and not their religious belief, it degenerates in to something approaching man-worship or idolatry. And idolatry of dead saints, goes hand in hand with hatred of living ones. The Romish Church canonized dead saints, and persecuted living ones. And if Bellamy or Edwards should now appear among men, preaching what they did when alive, would it be strange if some of their supposed admirers should cry,

* This is perfectly true. See how Mr. Young in his Chronicles denounces Douglass, Chalmers, Robertson, Burke, *et id genus omne;* because forsooth they believed the Puritans actuated by a little worldly ambition. He calls them contemptible sneerers!!—Young's Chronicles, p. 48.—Alas, why is it that so many, if you lisp a syllable against the Puritans, are transported into downright fury! If such people are like the Puritans themselves, of old, no wonder England was out of patience with them.

"Away with them?' We cannot think that Christ was pointing at a sin confined to the Pharisees, alone, when he said, 'Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets.'"

This is about the coronation of a climax, some will surely think, and yet the writer is not quite content; he gives Mr. Bacon a Parthian arrow as he leaves him, for broaching the old theory of development for the exigencies of the age. "Lack of sympathy with the popular heart" is, with Mr. Bacon, "a fatal disqualification for the pulpit." The reviewer aptly reminds him of that shout which once burst from the "popular heart," "Great is Diana of the Ephesians"! He might better have reminded him of another, which was once brought to the mind of an older pleader for popular infallibility. 'I *must* be right,' said John Wesley, 'for *vox populi, vox Dei.*' 'Yes,' replied his sister, with a wit and wisdom any *man* who ever lived might envy, 'it said, Crucify him! Crucify him!' Wesley was paralyzed into silence; and would to Heaven the developing tendencies of Puritanism might ever be thus arrested. But alas! as the prophet said of old, "My people love to have it so," and the forewarning query, "What will ye do in the end thereof?" is lost upon unwilling ears, like "the sounding again of the mountains."* The law, the most sacred of laws, which Puritanic Independency impressed upon its own destinies, in the Great Manifesto of the days of the Commonwealth, to be never yesterday and to-day the same, abides with it, and rules it still. Mr. Bacon and his fellow semi-pelagians, per-

* Jer. v. 31. Ezek. vii. 7.

fectionists, &c., &c.,* are but carrying out its legitimate aim. And when I see Presbyterianism rising to rebuke it, as in the extracts just given, I do but seem to hear the voices of such as Thomas Edwards and Robert Baillie, echoing from the vistas of the past.

P. S.—To show how effectually Presbyterianism has been kept out of Massachusetts—more effectually far than Episcopacy—I add the following statistics. Morse, in his Geography of 1792, gives the number of Presbyterians in Massachusetts, in 1750, as 2,994. In 1792, as 2,776.—While Hayward, in his statistics of 1836, says they have but *two* churches in the whole State.—Morse's Geog. p. 171. Hayward 143.

LETTER XVIII.

The present letter will be the last of this series, and will be devoted to the consideration of sufferers at the hands of the Puritans, who deserve a far more honored place among such sufferers, than multitudes, who have no particular sympathy with the Puritans, are willing to allow. I allude to the

* Independency may create such a brood now, as it did of old. "It was out of Independency, that there sprang the numerous sects which are the reproach of Presbyterianism, and of itself—the Sabbatarians, Millenarians, Grindletonians, Muggletonians, Fifth-Monarchists, Ranters, Seekers, Quakers, Anabaptists; with many others, more short-lived than these."—Rise of Old Dissent, exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood, by J. Hunter. London, 1842, p. 61. Mr. Hunter, I presume, is a Presbyterian! See his pref. p. xii.

And see the Churchman of Sept. 13, 1834, for some amusing comments on Perfectionism, tracing its succession *through* Doctors Taylor and Beecher.

Aborigines. I am reluctant to believe, what the testimony of history requires me to admit, that my countrymen of all classes have too little fellow feeling for "the poor Indian"—far less than becomes professed and forward advocates for the doctrine of an equality of natural rights. This doctrine is elaborately set forth in our Declaration of Independence; which solemnly announces that *all* men—not one nation, or one clan, but all men without distinction of rank or color—are born free and equal. It is difficult to account for this, but upon the supposition that we are conscious of an immense amount of wrong-doing towards this unfortunate race; and that it is the peculiarity of the wrong-doer, rather than of the injured, to retain intense dislike. Proprium humani ingenii est odisse quem læseris.

However, if Americans generally have failed in compassion for the unhappy fortunes of the Red Man, the Puritans should have been the very last among them to do so. They had given sacred and voluntary pledges to treat them with the utmost consideration. These letters effectually prove, what an incomparable favor Puritans deemed royal charters—how they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte to their schemes for obtaining such "a precious boon."—But the very, the exact, the grand consideration, for which those charters were imparted, was a Christian devotion to the best welfare of the native inhabitants of America. This point, like others, has been alluded to before. It must now come up formally. I appeal, then, to the language of the Charter—I must beg my readers to be particular in their recollections—not of the King's letter, or the King's mandamus, but of the great parchment Charter of Massachusetts; which Mr. Bancroft once said was unrolled with so much state, when an enlargement of territory was hoped for.—"And we do of our further grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, give and grant to the said Governor and Company, and their successors, &c., for the directing, ruling,

and disposing of all other matters and things, whereby our said people, inhabitants there, may be so religiously, peaceably, and civilly governed, as their good life and orderly conversation may win and incite the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind, and the Christian faith; *which in our royal intention,* and the adventurers' free profession, is the principal end of this plantation.*"† The language of the Charter of Connecticut is precisely similar, with two variations. It reads "win and invite;" for "win and incite;" which may possibly be a typographical error. And it also reads "the *only* and principal end of this plantation"‡—a somewhat ominous addition; as if negligence, or something worse, required the English Government to be more emphatic upon a point, rather too costly to the pocket and trying to patience, to be remembered with perfect precision!

So then, it appears, that these celebrated Charters were granted, not upon an implied or virtual, but upon the expressed and literal stipulation and condition, that the Puritan "adventurers" should put forth their best and most unwearied efforts, for the conversion of the natives of New England to Christianity. This was the matter of fact *quid pro quo*—was neither more nor less than the plain price, or *bonus* as we might now say, which they, of their own unconstrained accord, paid for these charters. It is true, indeed, that the king might receive other and further compensation; as, *e g.*, a fifth of the revenue of mines and gold and silver. But

* Or "intentions:" I am not certain about the reading.

† Anc. Charters, &c., p. 14. Cradock's letter, Felt's Salem, p. 11.

‡ Hazard's Collect, ii. 602. Hinman's Antiquities, 183. And further. This peculiarity of the Charter was occasionally confessed. See a preamble to an act about the Indians, p. 95 of the Connecticut Laws, edit. 1769. There is one drawback, however. The Charter says, "the only," &c. The preamble Jesuitically lowers this very decided language, and says, "one great end." This is interpreting a Constitution by the favorite rule, "as I understand it." We see where the rule comes from.

all that was problematical. The sure and certain compensation which was provided for, was the conversion of the natives to Christianity; and the granting Charters to distant settlements for such a noble object, were an act which might well entitle a monarch to that highest of human appellations, "The father of his country."

Thus it appears, that it was the King of England, (bigoted Churchman, and half-papist as they esteemed him,) rather than the Puritans,* who took the Aborigines into a kind consideration, and prospectively regarded their welfare. And if the Puritans had seconded the King's wishes without delay—had acceded with all their hearts to his terms, in respect to the missionary requital expected for charter privileges and protection—and had labored, at once and zealously, to fulfil their contract, by devoting undivided efforts to the conversion of the Indians—making that their only or principal business, as it was the only and principal end of their plantation—I say, if they had done all this, they had done no more than a duty which might have been exacted of them by a human court of law! They would have gone not a whit beyond common mercantile honesty, in the fulfilment of a pecuniary contract. They would have merited not one single plaudit.

But how different, how immensely different, the representations usually made of this affair! Do but look into such a volume as that fourth of the third series of the Massachusetts Historical Collections, and see. Here is line upon line, tract upon tract, to display the wonders of Puritan philanthropy, for the victim of heathenism in New England. And the series of goodly tales is ushered into new-born life, by a publishing committee, "as authentic narratives of the

* No wonder even Dr. Dwight was constrained to say, as he reviewed Puritan and Episcopal annals, "I really believe, that the English Church has done more than most others to promote the cause of Christianity."—Travels, i. 61.

GREAT EFFORTS, made by some of the fathers in our Israel, for the spiritual welfare of the children of the forest." Great efforts! Are those great efforts of charity, which are made in mere payment of a debt—for the fulfilment of a legal bond? The Jesuit of North America asked for no charter, but went with his life in his hands, into the depths of the forest; and shared an Indian's fare, and an Indian's toils, so he might "win and invite" him to *his* faith. "*Ibo, et non redibo,*" was his foreboding farewell. And when he died, as he often did, a martyr, (his whole body, perhaps, converted into a blazing torch,) he could depart without a murmur for his fate, the name of Jesus breathed forth with his last sigh!*

And yet a Puritan will tell us, he was but a political emissary dispatched by France,† to stir up the northern tribes for the massacre of himself and family; while he, whose chartered duty it was to convert Indians, could foredoom them to destruction, and still be all the while an emissary of God! A Puritan minister is recorded by Increase Mather in his Indian Troubles, who "publickly declared that he foresaw the destruction of the Narragansett nation; solemnly confirming his speech by saying, *If God do not destroy that people, then say that his Spirit hath not spoken by me.*" And adds Mather, with his own oracular presumption, "Surely that holy man was a prophet."‡ Such an incendiary as this, safe in his nest, is Heaven's own prophet; while a Jesuit, hacked in pieces, or consumed by a slow fire, for his efforts to convert infidels, is the mere tool of chicanery and the slave of superstition! I blush for Protestantism, that history wrings from me the shameful comparison.

* Bancroft, iii. 137–141.

† The words of Gov. Bradford might be retorted by the French and Dutch too; for he confessed the Indians had *English* guns, because the French and Dutch were too slight. This shows where the guns of the Indians came from.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. iii. 83.

‡ Mather's Ind. Troubles, edit. 1677, p. 60.

And, moreover, if we grant a license to Puritan rhetoric about the "great efforts" made by its fathers in Israel, no small deduction must be made when we come to dry, dull fact. For when did these great efforts begin? The Charter of Masssachusetts was granted in 1629. And our volume of *memorabilia*, just adverted to, opens with the date of a post-note which has had an extension, viz., with October 28, 1646, i. e., seventeen years later! A somewhat liberal allowance of time, to attend to the principal and only end of their settlement; but which, I suppose, must be granted to those, who were always right while every body else was wrong. They could found a college; for Harvard University had its beginning in 1638. They could establish an Iron Works Company, for the manufacture possibly of swords and guns, as well as pruning-hooks and ploughshares.* They could make voyages to sell captive Indians into slavery, and come back with cargoes of cotton, tobacco, salt, and *negroes*:† and this as early as 1637; that is, in *eight* years after a Charter had been granted them. But as to any thing like a just fulfilment of their indebtedness for Indian conversions—why, twice that period was enough to think about it.[125] Polemical theology in the schools, manufactures, trade and traffic in luxuries as well as necessaries—in "cheese, wine, oil, and strong water,"‡ in "slaves and souls of men"§ must be attended to beforehand. And to help on trade, and traffic, and war, other abominations of later days, the press-gang and conscription systems might be

[125] See Note 125.

---

* Felt's Salem, p. 167.

† Ibid. p. 109.—Hutchinson, i. 26, note. See also Note 124.

‡ Felt's Salem, p. 62.

§ Slaves were made of both Indians and Africans! Felt's Ipswich, pp. 119, 120. Also of poor debtors!! Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 330.

resorted to.* But religion for the poor heathen—oh, for that, they must wait for greater leisure?

Notwithstanding they were not without sound rebukes for their illegal and dishonest, as well as unchristian negligence. Before the Charter was brought over and laid upon a shelf, where no eyes but their own could see it,† and discover in it disturbing reminiscences, they were carefully exhorted by the Company in England, not to "be unmindful of the mayne end of our plantation, by endeavoringe to bring the Indians to the knowledge of the Gospel."‡ Roger Williams, the victim of their persecution and outlawry, remembered the duty of the Colony, and set them an example, had they followed which, an immense amount of blood and treasure had been unwasted.§ And an Episcopalian, recalling the conditions of an Episcopal King's Charter, invoked their attention to their duty, years before they harkened to any purpose whatsoever. Thomas Lechford, a lawyer, from England, and a Churchman, spent the four years from 1637 to 1641 in Massachusetts, in the practice of his profession.|| On his return to the mother country, he published his "Plaine Dealing;" in which, among other things, he tells us how plainly he dealt with the Puritans

* Felt's Salem, p. 76. Plymouth Col. Laws, 112, 121, 199. Anc. Col. Laws, &c. 130.

† The Charter was carried away by stealth; and that it was, which made the English Government issue orders to stop emigration, unless the emigrants would take the oath of allegiance; and no wonder.—Chalmer's Revolt. i. 49.

‡ Felt's Salem, p. 11.

§ Williams remonstrated with them too, most pathetically, in after years. Let this appeal suffice as a specimen. "I beseech you consider, how the name of the most holy and jealous God may be preserved, between the clashings of these two, viz., the glorious conversion of the Indians in New England, and the unnecessary wars and cruel destructions of the Indians in New England."—R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 155.

|| Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 399.

about their duties to the Aborigines.* And no wonder; for not the King of England only had manifested the deepest anxiety for the conversion of the Indians, but one of that King's high-church bishops declared, that nothing but age and infirmities prevented him from going to America, and devoting himself to the work, arduous as it might be.† A high-churchman in lawn could hardly be contented to be outdone by a Jesuit in such business; however complacently that eclipse could be endured by a Puritan, while filling his pocket with gold ‡ for the sale of human flesh—tickling his palate with "cheese, wine, oil, and strong water," and going to taverns to hear sermons.§

But with such hard and frequent hints as to his duty, and with that duty symbolized and stamped upon the very seal of his Colony, (for the device on the Massachusetts seal was an Indian with a label at his mouth, containing the words, *Come over and help us!*) a Puritan could still hold out. Seventeen years give him time barely sufficient to look about him, and think wherefore he was an adventurer from his natal soil.

But *then*, surely, he does his duty manfully, and with good grace. Alas! would that I could say so. His Elders, who are forward enough in *civil* matters, and who can prophetically send the poor Indians to perdition, have to be provoked to the work of converting them by a legislature.|| And even then, perhaps, nothing had been accomplished but for the earnestness of a single man; whose marvellous devotion Hutchinson tries to portray, by saying, that he ap-

* Lechford's tract is reprinted in 3d vol. 3d series, Mass. Hist. Coll. See especially, pp. 80, 88.

† Sparks' Am. Biog. 1st ser. v. 36.

‡ "The grosse *Goddons*, or great masters, as also some of their merchants, are damnable rich."—Josselyn's Voyages, Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 331.

§ Felt's Salem, 61, 62.

|| Hutchinson, i. 151. Sparks' Am. Biog. 1st. ser. v. 38.

plied himself to his volunteered undertaking, "with zeal equal to that of the missionaries of the Romish Church."*

This man was the (so called) Apostle, John Eliot; for the Puritans could easily appropriate even a stronger word than *bishop*, when it was required to dignify one of their own order. Yet, Eliot could not commence his work † with even the self-sacrificing temper of a Jesuit, without acknowledging the remissness of former years. "But methinkes now," he says, in his "Day-Breaking of the Gospell," "that it is with the Indians, as it was with our New-English ground, when we first came over; there was scarce a man that could believe that English grain would grow, or that the plow could doe any good in this woody and rocky soile. And thus they continued, in this *supine unbeliefe*, for some years, till experience taught them otherwise; and now all see it to bee scarce inferiour to Old-English tillage, but beares very good burdens: so wee have thought of our Indian people."‡ However, there was one point on which he was deficient, with all his intelligence and zeal. He supposed that civilization must precede Christianity: after all, not making any great advance beyond the apprehensions of his countrymen whom he censured.§

Now the modern theory is, and it is undoubtedly the true one, that the direct application of the Gospel to the heathen, is the best method of proceeding. The Moravian missionaries in Greenland enlightened Christendom, upon this point of Christian policy. They found the story of a Saviour's atoning death, more effectual, even to begin with,

* Hutchinson, i. 152. Comp. Williams' Vermont, 1809, i. 271, 272.

† For which the Legislature vote him *ten* pounds, not out of their own pockets, but out of *twenty* left for that purpose by a pious lady! No wonder Josselyn should call them "inexplicably covetous."—See Felt's Salem, p. 176, and Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii 331. Also Sparks' Am. Biog. 1st ser. v. 129–131.

‡ Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iv. 15. § Hutchinson, i. 152, 153.

than arguments for the existence of a God.* And Jowett, a Church of England missionary for the countries around the Mediterranean, gives his attestation to the same power of the same truths.

And these have been looked upon as fruits of modern light and experience, when lo! the same result was reached by that Churchman, whom the posterity of the Puritans are wont to disparage for his "Plaine Dealing;" and was commended to the attention of the Puritans themselves, when he rebuked them for their supineness. "In vaine," says Lechford, "doe some think of civillizing them, either by the sword or otherwise, [it seems both alternatives were thought of, and which was first practised will duly appear,] till withall the Word of God hath spoken to their hearts: wherein I conceive great advice is to be taken."† Had so truly divine a thought come from a Puritan parson, it would have been pronounced an oracle. It teemed in the brain of an Episcopal lawyer, and the rubbish of centuries has been piled upon it.

And now, having shown, pretty effectually, how all the *good* the Puritans did the Indians was done only in fulfilment of bare legal duty—legal, i. e., in the human sense, and under the sanction of a human court, and of course a mere debt—it behoves me next, to show something also of the *evil* they did them, and which they dealt out with no slow or relenting hand. It may be expected by some, perhaps, that I should speak more at large of Eliot, before doing so. But if (for example) I were to eulogize Eliot for his Indian translation of the Scriptures, as a marvel of patient toil, I ought to eulogize the Dictionary of Sebastian Rallè, as a much greater; since it is far harder, and more praiseworthy, to make a Dictionary for a *whole* language, than to translate any one book in it, however important.

* Greenland Missions, Dublin, 1831, p. 90.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 91.

My Puritan readers, therefore, had better not form such expectations; for, assuredly, if I must praise their missionaries of legal obligation, I must praise the voluntary missionaries of the Jesuits ten times more. For their own sakes, therefore, I prefer to be silent.*

Upon the positive evil, however, done by the Puritans to the Aborigines, historical fidelity requires me not to be silent; and if my dealing, like Lechford's, is plain, it will be because my facts are palpable. Doubtless, their descendants will think me bitter, and that I have been poring over, and trying to exemplify, that even-handed justice, about which Shakspeare talks with as much truth as poetry, when he says it—

> Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
> To our own lips.

But I shall go on, fearless of censure; for probably the measure in store for me, is too copious to be much increased.†

And here, as has before seemed my lot, when I have been upon the brink of some fresh expanse of Puritan mischief, a sea of troubles, like that which I have beheld chafing the iron-bound shores of Massachusetts, opens before my eyes. The difficulty to be encountered is, not to find facts, but to class them, and give specimens. I must try a few under two or three captions, and refer to historians for more.

* "Of all that ever crossed the American seas," says the Presbyterian Baillie of the Puritans, "they are noted as most neglectful of the work of conversion."—Baillie's Dissuasive, p. 60.—I say no more of them, then, than the Presbyterians did.

† The Unitarian (!) Mr. Young gives one to understand, that a writer who impeaches Puritan virtue, loses all his respectability at one fell swoop. So I stand some chance of becoming a martyr.—Young's Chronicles, p. 48.

I.—My first point will be, that often the Indians did not receive fair compensation for their lands.

Chalmers, whose accuracy was so long put to the test about the Rhode Island law against Roman Catholics, and who came off triumphant, may well be relied on here. For myself I have the more confidence in him, because of the precision of his statement upon this litigated subject. He does not absolutely deny, that the Indians were compensated for the soil; but he says that proof of the fact has never been made out. This is his own language. "Yet it does not appear that any compensation was given to the natives, when possession was taken of their country, by a people who soon overspread the land, and unjustly deemed every exertion in its defence an act of rebellion against their laws." And he adds, with a gentle sarcasm, when he might have thundered in philippics, "Had the tribes any other mode of acquiring experience, than from the tradition of their fathers, what a school of knowledge, moral and political, would the colonial annals open to their researches!"*

No doubt this is the exact state of the matter: *non est inventus* must often be returned upon the search-warrant for Indian deeds of soil. Neal himself seems clearly to be under this impression; for when Mather, in his Magnalia, roundly asserts that the Indian lands were paid for, he ominously comments thus, "If the Doctor's allegations are true."† Nothing but allegations to sustain the doctrine, in Neal's view, and those allegations so suspicious that they must be alloyed with a base "if." It is not surprising, that

* Chalmers' Annals, p. 154. The Indians could complain, however, and did complain in their way.—See poor Old Will's murmurs. Coffin's Newburyport, p. 363.

† Neal's New England, i. 155. So Dr. Dwight, after all his zealous defence of the Puritans, has to say, "unless I am deceived." He excepts also the country of the Pequots.—Dwight's Travels, i. 167.

one more accurate than Neal, (the editor of Winthrop,) should utter as a maxim, 'Put not your faith in Mather.'*

And when we come down to later authorities, there is the same melancholy deficiency of available evidence. Not, I mean, for want of strong allegation, as in Mather's case. Oh no! Felt, and Young, and Knowles even, maintain stoutly that the Indians *did* receive compensation.

But what is Mr. Felt's best proof† to show that Indian claims to land were equitably extinguished? A direction from the Company in England, before the secret transfer of the Charter, that such things should be attended to. Very well, exceedingly well, so far as it goes. But a more solemn instrument, the Charter itself, gave a most explicit direction as to the conversion of the Indians—a duty long, and some will think, wantonly disregarded. And if in respect to debts towards souls, which are of much value, the Puritans were so negligent, what is to be inferred as to their attention to debts, of lesser value indeed in God's eye, but of far greater value in man's—viz. those which might be disastrous to the pocket?

Yet this same direction is one of Mr. Young's strong proofs;‡ while Mr. Knowles§ goes to the North American Review, and Vattel's Law of Nations—this last, an amusing proof indeed—as if an allegation on this side of the Atlantic, echoed by a European, ought to be listened to by all the world! Vattel, moreover, gives an authority of the blindest kind for his opinion, viz. "History of the English Colonies in North America;" but *by whom*, he does not say, nor does he give date, page, or volume. However, this is quite sufficient, is

* Savage's Wint. ii. 331, note.

† Felt's Salem, pp. 17, 22, 24. Yet, even on Mr. Felt's own showing, the Company at home thought it necessary to speak, more than once. And the Puritans were very dull of hearing upon this subject, as we shall see by and by.

‡ Chronicles, p. 259, note. § Knowles' R. Williams, p. 96.

perfect demonstration to an advocate of Puritan honesty; and doubtless would remain so, if perchance found in a book, which the Chrysostom of modern Puritans calls "that most unscrupulous and malicious of lying narratives, Peters' History of Connecticut."*

And by the way, since I have introduced him casually, I may as well go on to observe, that our Chrysostom, (whom any one would recognize by the golden specimen of his eloquence now quoted,) is particularly nervous upon this subject of Indian compensation, and gives a somewhat funny sign of it. "Patents and charters from the king," he says, "were *never* considered good against the rights of the natives. Let any man demonstrate if he can, that in Connecticut," &c.† Not so fast, not so fast, O logician, *ventis et fulminis ocyor alis.* You are perpetrating a *non sequitur.* You assert roundly, that a king's patent was *never* considered good against a native's rights, and then attempt to prove your proposition true by the history of Connecticut.‡ But this will by no means answer. "Never" covers the history of Massachusetts; and it is with Massachusetts principally that I have to do.

And now, who but the willingly forgetful, (and I intended this fact as one of my strong arguments *per contra,*) need to be reminded, that one of the grand heads and fronts of Roger Williams' offending—one of the procuring causes of his cruel banishment—was the fact, that he maintained the insufficiency of the King's Charter to entitle settlers to the soil? § And what induced him to be so zealous about such

* Bacon's Histor. Discourses, p. 34. Mr. B. should remember, that he has admitted in the same volume, that even David Brainerd could be a slanderer, p. 245. This is leaving himself a very narrow chance indeed!

† Ibid. p. 330.

‡ Was New Haven fairly purchased? See Drake's Old Ind. Chron. p. 156.

§ To show how long this continued a touchy point, see Bulkley's ela-

a matter, if a different doctrine were not prevalent in his day? Did the Indians put such a metaphysical crotchet into his head? Alas! they could not reason like Mr. Bacon; and so Mr. Knowles loathly admits, that Williams' book upon the subject was "probably called forth by some expression of the opposite doctrine."* Perhaps some may think, from such a confident assertion as is quoted by Mr. Young from the lips of Gov. Winslow † of Plymouth, about the purchase of Indian lands in that colony, that Massachusetts *only* must bear the blame and shame, of controverting and condemning Roger Williams, for his argument against a monarch's right to give away soil he no more owned than he did the moon. But Mr. Felt declares that Mr. Williams' doctrine was "the occasion of much controversy," "both at Plymouth and Salem."‡

Non nostrûm inter vos, tantas componere lites. I must leave such contrarieties of statement where I found them, and proceed.

It will doubtless be esteemed owing to the perversities of my Episcopal vision, but I cannot refrain from saying, that, in their sentiments about the virtue of a royal patent in giving away territory, the Puritans exhibit another of their points of similarity with the Papists. The Pope could give away territory for the Jesuit: the King could give away territory for the Puritan. Both were equally well satisfied with the endowment, with its morality, and its efficiency. Each could persecute the opponent of his sovereign claim, under such supreme authority. What the Papists did in

borate essay in 1724, to prove that the Indians had no right to the soil, and that his ancestors were not fools enough to suppose they had. Bulkley tries to come down like a regular trump.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. iv. 159.

* Knowles' Williams, p. 60.

† Young's Chronicles, p. 259, note.—See also Note 126.

‡ Felt's Salem, p. 17.

South America, and Mexico especially, need not be particularized. The making such an opponent the victim of public accusation and banishment, is one of Puritanism's earliest sins in North America. Roger Williams' opinions about the Charter, as conferring no title to foreign soil, formed the basis of "the first article in his indictment."* There is no evading this awkward and damning fact: it is stamped upon Puritan records with a truly Indian dye.

And there is the more reason to believe its truth; for the Puritans manifested what may be called a proclivity for the doctrine which produced it, *before* they reached these shores. The question about a right to Indian territory, was no novelty. It had been discussed by them in England †—or, rather, its discussion had been forced upon them by objectors. And what was the answer then, when there was no royal patent under whose broad ban they might plead more safely, and in such a flattering way that royalty's self would be beguiled to silence? It was plumply this: "This savage people ruleth over many lands, without title or property, [A *petitio principii* at the outset;] for they inclose no ground, neither have they cattle to maintayne it, but remove their dwellings as they have occasion, [and Nomades require evidently a great extent of what may be called loose territory,] or as they can prevail against their neighbor. And why may not Christians have liberty to go and dwell amongst them, in their waste lands and woods, (leaving them such places as they have manured for their corn,) as lawfully as Abraham did among the Sodomites,"‡ This is by a Puritan parson, afterwards settled in the very town whence Roger

* Benedict's Baptists, i. 454, note.—Sav. Wint. i. 122.—So Connecticut was claimed by the same warrant.—Hutch. Hist. i. 46.

† Walker's Independency, Pt. iii. p. 22.

‡ Hutch. Collect. p. 30. Compare Bulkley in Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. iv. 159. Also, 2d ser. viii. 86. And 3d ser. iii. 331. Also, Walker's Independency, Pt. iii. 22.

Williams was banished ; and he ought to have remembered Abraham's deed in fee simple, in the best of all registers, and from the top of all authority, " Arise, walk through the land, in the length of it and in the breadth of it ; for I will give it unto thee."* Such sophistry about the case of Abraham, might easily introduce greater sophistry, under a sanction vastly inferior ; and that sophistry, (for a wrong cause always uses force or passion in preference to cool argument,) could angrily defend itself, by the decree of a Court and the sacrifice of a victim. This explains the case and the fate of Roger Williams to the full, and I need advert to them no longer.

Still, I suppose, notwithstanding such difficulties, great names will be quoted, and a great clamor raised to show that the Indians were fairly dealt by; and Mr. Bacon will stand ready, as the procession and the shout go forward, to cry out against every refractory knee which does not do them homage: just as he would do, if he were a Romanist in some Romish land, and the host were passing by. Let me say then, that if stiff allegations can be found by scores, and here and there some straggling deed of sale, that satisfaction will not quite be given. Hutchinson, on one of his pages, shows that such deeds might be virtually extorted ;† that an Indian brain might conceive such a possibility and act upon it—nay, act upon it bloodily, as an outrageous wrong. It is thus he explains the war of King Philip.—" Philip was a man of a high spirit, and could not bear to see the English of New Plymouth extending their settlements over the dominions of his ancestors; and although his father had, at one time or other, conveyed to them all that they were possessed of, yet *he had sense enough to distinguish a free, voluntary covenant, from one made under a*

* Gen. xiii. 17. Compare Gen. xii. 1, 7.

† Compare such a submission, *e. g.* as was drawn out of the Indians at Ipswich, and consummated by " a pot full of wine."—Felt's Ipswich, pp. 4, 5.—Who then taught the Indians to love strong drink ?

sort of duresse, and he could never rest until he brought on the war which ended in his destruction."* Callender insists upon it that King Philip went to war reluctantly.† Would he ever have attempted to vindicate, by so dreaded an expedient, any but enormous wrongs.‡ Had he and his been treated as the Indians of Pennsylvania were treated by William Penn, might not his alliance with the Puritans, like that of Pennsylvania, have lasted unbroken for more than seventy years?§

There *is* proof, fortunately, that the Indians of Massachusetts could be quiet and friendly, if dealt by honestly—a fair bargain made with them for their lands, and a fair compensation, not promised merely, but actually rendered. Look, for example, into Shattuck's History of the Town of Concord, and you will see an array of sales and purchases, which you will not find in the histories of some other Puritan settlements.[127] And in the history of the same town, there is a corresponding absence of Indian hostilities. And why is this? Another historian of Concord explains it most significantly. "The settlers," says he, "never had any contest with the Indians; nor were there ever by them but three persons killed within the limits of the town. It is supposed, 'That the cause of their quietness was owing, in a good measure, to the full satisfaction they received at

[127] See Note 127.

---

* Hutchinson, i. 258, 259. Compare page 252. Compare also, R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 22, 46. and the references there given.

† R. I. Hist. Coll. iv. 126, note.

‡ One of these enormous wrongs was the siezure and ill-treatment of his brother, on bare suspicion—treatment which occasioned his death. Could they expect uneducated savages to forgive such things, when they, the best of Christians, could *never* forgive the Pequots?—Hutch. Hist. i. 252, note.

§ Proud's Pennsylvania, i. 212. Watson's Philadelphia, pp. 93, 128, 129. Watson says *eighty* years.

the time of purchase.' "* Ah! if other settlers had resembled those of Concord, it would not have been necessary for Mather to put on record such quarrels, as he owns, (in one instance at least,) began about alleged encroachments on Indian lands; nor would he have dared, with the common presumption of his sect, to arrogate the interference of the Almighty in behalf of them, and say, "God ended the controversy, by sending the small-pox among the Indians."† Oh, this cruel doubling of God's chastisements, by calling them direct judgments in vindication of themselves! how characteristic of the Puritans, and of multitudes who now inherit a Puritan temper without the name! But it flowed naturally from their opinionated self-consequence. Of those who presumed to differ from their platform, (assuming but the right they themselves exercised and defended, when they left England and the Church of England,) this was their pontifical style of speaking, not outdone in the Epistles of the Vatican: "Men have set up their thresholds by God's threshold, and their post by God's post." And, again, such persons "do no better than set up an altar against the Lord's altar."‡ It is any thing but surprising, that such people looked upon themselves, as the only true portion of the Church on earth, and as receiving New England, as it were, from God's own hands, in the manner the Jews received Canaan. *Their* threshold, *their* post, *their* altar, [no quarrel with the Puseyite word in those days] were God's; and he had, he would have, he could have, no others. But oh, the wonder, the wonder of all wonders, that such people could upbraid Ap. Laud as an exclusive!

* Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. i. 241. Compare Du Pratz's Louisiana, ii. 206.

† Mather's Indian Troubles, p. 23.

‡ Neal's N. Eng. ii. 356.—It is curious, to the philosophical observer of human nature, to find their complaints of altars against their own altar, made against their Independent brethren in England by a Presbyterian! —Edwards' Antapologia, p. 199, 200.

It is too easy to be discursive on such topics, and I must therefore close this branch of my subject with two au-authorities, one of which goes point-blank against the doctrine, that the Indians were compensated for their lands, and the other is as effective for the same purpose, though less direct. The first is that of S. G. Drake, Esq., whose research into Indian history has not been surpassed in our day, if in any other. This is one of his impracticable memoranda. "These Indian places, *Misham*, since Charlestown; *Matapan*, since Dorchester; and *Shawmut*, since Boston; are intruded into and possessed by Englishmen; whose descendants, to this day, hold them with as much right as another people would, who should come now and crowd them out, and whose manners and occupations might be as different from theirs, as those of their ancestors were from those of the Indians."* The other authority I suppose to be Dr. Bentley of Salem, one of the best antiquarians of his day. He says of the inhabitants of Salem, *e. g.*, (whom Drake, by the way, pronounces intruders,) that "as soon as they heard of Penn's purchase, they purchased their lands of such Indians as they could find, though *fifty years* afterwards, still remembering the doctrine of the patent."†

Could those people who were seventeen years' long unable to recollect "the principal end" of their emigration, the conversion of the natives; twenty-six years' long heedless, even in an Indian's eye, of the Gospel's value;‡ and fifty years' long unable to recollect their debt for the soil they trod upon; have cared over-much for Indian claims or for Indian rights, for Indian bodies or for Indian souls?

* Drake's Old Ind. Chronicle, p. 155.

† Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. viii. 4. See also Lincoln's Hingham, p. 159, etc. for similar conduct.—And yet Bogue and Bennet have the hardihood to say, that Penn imitated the Puritans in his treatment of the Indians!! Hist. of Dissenters, ii. 431.

‡ Hutchinson, i. 150.

I turn now to a brief consideration of one or two topics more, and this letter shall then close.

II.—My second point is, that the Puritans, in their treatment of the Indians, began with guns rather than the Gospel.[128]

Roger Williams, heretic though he were, began more sagaciously and kindly. "My soul's desire," said he, "was to do the natives good."* And with him, this was not mere solemn language, to be recorded in a diary, or to go home to England in what would be termed an Evangelical epistle.—He showed his faith by his works.† Notwithstanding, with true Christian humility, he ascribed the virtue he practised to "the healthful Spirit of God's grace." "God was pleased," he continued, "to give me a painful, patient spirit, to lodge with them in their filthy, smoky holes, (even while I lived at Plymouth and Salem,) to gain their tongue."

And what was the result of such condescending Christian treatment? Neither more nor less than this, that Roger Williams, *even after his banishment*, was able to be of more service to Massachusetts, than regiments of dragoons or parks of artillery. Had he been as vindictive as the cruel State which banished him, and never relaxed in her imperial inflexibility, he might almost have fulfilled the hyperbole of Hushai, to the letter, and dragged Boston into the ocean.‡ But he had the true forgiving spirit of his Master, and returned good for evil.§ Two sentences which he wrote in his Letter of Vindication to Major Mason, are worth all the religious diaries which have been written since the days of Martin Luther. Indeed, I know not any higher or fairer

[128] See Note 128.

---

* Knowles' Williams, p. 52.

† He "spared not purse, nor pains, nor hazards."—R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 153.

‡ 2 Sam. xvii. 13. § Hutch. Hist. i. 42. Benedict's Bap. i. 477.

testimony of exalted Christian virtue, than they afford, since the time when apostolic martyrs counted not their lives dear, so that they might testify of the Gospel of the grace of God. For, in practical religion, *active benevolence to those we can neglect*, is the foremost of excellencies; standing even before freedom from the world's taint and corruption.* The sentences alluded to, (true patents of Christian nobility, worth those of a dozen dukedoms,) are these: "When God wondrously preserved me, and helped me to break to pieces the Pequots' negociation and design, and to make, promote, and finish, by many travells and charges, the English league with the Nahiggonsiks and Monhiggins [Narragansetts and Mohegans] against the Pequots, and that the English forces marched up to the Nahiggonsik country against the Pequots, I gladly entertained at my house in Providence, the general Stoughton and his officers, and used my utmost care that all his officers and soldiers should be well accommodated with us. I marched up with them to the Nahiggonsik Sachems, and brought my countrymen and the barbarians, Sachems and Captains, to a mutuall confidence and complacence each in other."†

Such was the way in which a genuine Christian began his career with the Indians, and such was his triumph over their barbarism, and the cruelty of his unrelenting persecutors. Truly his godliness, coupled with contentment amid all the roughnesses of his destiny, brought him great gain at last. If Roger Williams had never lived another day, after recording such a passage in his chequered life, he might have said his *Nunc dimittis*, and laid him down to die, as one of the veriest Christian heroes who ever adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour—or, if I may attend to criticism in such a page as this, the doctrine of the Saviour our God.‡

* James i. 27. † Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. i. 277.
‡ Titus, ii. 10. See the Greek

But how was it with others, who, as Mather says in his Indian Troubles, "proposed not so much worldly as spiritual ends in their undertaking," and who, "ayming at the *Conversion* of the *Indians* [his own Italics] and the establishment of the worship of God in purity, did therefore transport themselves and families into this howling wilderness"?* Did they begin as Roger Williams did? Alas, how differently! Mather who professes an exact acquaintance with Indian history, admits that the Indians had been maltreated by his countrymen, who touched on the Massachusetts shore on their fishing expeditions, before the arrival of "the Pilgrims." The Indians, therefore, he says, were in a state of exasperation against the English, when "the Pilgrims" arrived. Well then, there was all the more reason that they, such matchless emigrants for "spiritual ends," should have imitated such as Williams, and approached them as familiarly and blandly as he did. Williams acquired such influence over their rugged natures, that he could venture among them, and stay "three days and nights,"† when they were fresh from battle—when, as he says, their "hands and arms methought reeked with the blood of my countrymen."‡ But his superiors in *proposing* (Mather hits the idea exactly, they *proposed* many a good deed they never thought of exemplifying) to act a Christian part towards the poor Indians, no sooner receive a few harmless arrows from them, than a quick reply comes from a musket, followed by a death-shriek, the forerunner to a thousand more.§ Well might John Robinson rebuke them,

* Indian Troubles, p. 5.

† Roger Williams could live in peace with them, without difficulty. So Richard Smith lived in their very midst, 40 years, without molestation, when they were 30,000 in number.—(Drake O. I. Chron. 157.) Well might Williams pray the Puritans to consider "Whether it be not only possible, but very easy, to live and die in peace with the natives."—R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 154.

‡ Letter to Maj. Mason.

§ Mather's Troubles, p. 6.

as he afterwards did, in this memorable language, "O how happy a thing had it been, that you had converted some before you killed any!"* They ought to have received far sharper rebukes from their own consciences. But no, the spirit which developed itself with powder and ball, continued to follow the same direction. A foolish Indian bravado, even, is answered in the temper of a modern duelist. The sachem of those Narragansets,† (whom Roger Williams conciliated without perhaps an angry word,) provoked, no doubt, by some of his evil information, sent a bundle of arrows, wrapped in a rattle-snake skin to an Indian at Plymouth, whom Mather himself allows to have been a knave.‡ The Governor is told, that it signifies "Enmity and War." He receives the communication in its worst construction, at once fires up, and without the slightest effort to soften his barbarian neighbor's imagined wrath, sends the rattle-snake's skin back filled with powder and shot, and adds this furious message, 'That if he had shipping at hand, he would endeavour to beat the Indians out of their country.'§

Nor was this the worst result of an intercourse, which began with such violence, that even an occasional interlude of peace only tended to heighten the suspicion and alienation of the parties. 'What is the reason,' said one of the Sachems to the English, 'that when we come to visit you, you hold the mouths of your guns against us?' And the answer, so ominously hypocritical || as to make even a barba-

* Drake's Old Chronicle, p. 155. Sparks' Am. Biog. 1st ser. v. 37.

† This was Canonicus, one of the best friends the English ever had. R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 42.—Canonicus solemnly declared to Roger Williams, he had *never* done the English any wrong.—R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 47.—Finally, a friendly Indian accompanied the embassy.—Davis' Morton, p. 75, note.—Young's Chronicles, p. 281.

‡ Neal says "an arch knave."—N. Eng. i. 97.

§ Mather's Troubles, pp. 10, 11.

|| The word "hypocritical" may seem too hard. If so, let a later instance of Puritan diplomacy be compared with this, to bear it out.

rian shake his head, was, 'Such is the English manner of entertaining friends.'*

O, if such records pertained to the lives of the papistical Hernando Cortez and Francis Pizarro, we should be told that every item was in perfect keeping—that this was just what might be expected from a religion, which claims foreign territory by virtue of inherent saintship, and is authorized to maintain its claims by force and arms.† How, then, are such approaches towards the Indians, from those *proposing* to save their souls, to be pronounced free from the slightest taint of worldliness? Cortez and Pizarro did not even begin as bad as the Puritans did, *i. e.*, with open war. In the end, however, the Mexicans and Peruvians were sleeping in bloody graves, in a soil over which they or their myrmidons walked the masters. The Puritans shed Indian blood, almost immediately; and the result was precisely the same as with the wretched proprietors of Peru and Mexico: the soil changed hands entirely, and its original owners died not deaths of peace; many of them died in the bondage of slavery in distant lands.[129] Even the son of the greatest

[129] See Note 129.

Here is a deliberately drawn article of Puritan management, to make their private concert seem like a providential unity, and thus induce a superstitious people to think they were half inspired. "That the magistrates (as far as might be) ripen their consultations beforehand, that their vote in public might bear, as the voice of God." (Savage's Wint. i. 178.) Such Machiavellian art as this article recommends, seems fit for a council of Jesuits only. Still I have heard of matters concocted in a "conference-room" a night previous, over which the blessing of God was next day asksd, as if the suggestions of the moment. And I cannot but think, in such circumstances, of the old "article of faith" just quoted.

* Mather's Troubles, p. 15.—In a salute the mouth of the gun is pointed *upwards*, not *at* the person saluted. The answer, however, was worthy "that Puritan-Papist, the Jesuit."

† This is one of the six principles of Independency, recorded by Walker.—Hist. Indep. Pt. iii. 22.

Sachem and chieftain, the Indians ever knew, (King Philip of Mount Hope,) is doomed to death in cold blood, and receives banishment and slavery as a boon.* He was but nine years old, and still, if the advice of Puritan parsons had prevailed, the innocent child would have gone like a lamb to the slaughter!!! † Nevertheless, we are required to believe, that the Jesuits or Inquisitors, who are suspected of contriving such a death as that of Don Carlos, son of Philip II., are monsters of iniquity; while they who contrived the death of the son of Philip of Mount Hope, are to shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars, forever and ever! O, the astounding changes of that Great Day, when all the crooked passages in human history shall be made straight, and its rough places plain!

This last specification reminds me that my next head, and the only one that can further be attended to, (for the present at least,) may as well be now brought forward. It might occupy more space than any of the others, but my limits warn me to compress it, if possible, into the briefest.

III. My third and last point in this melancholy argument accordingly is, that the Puritans treated the Indians with excessive cruelty. ‡

* With all his special pleading, Mr. Everett cannot stand this, but bursts out against it quite Demosthenically. See Orations, &c. pp. 611, 612. With this horrid passage in history, compare the language of a conscientious, though perhaps not formally Christian savage. "We," said he, "could easily be too hard for the English; but," striking his breast, "the Englishmen's God makes us afraid here." Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. i. 95.

† Baylies' Plymouth, iii. 190, 191, and notes.

‡ King Charles II., in his Commission of 1664, told Massachusetts to her face, that the *natives* entered this complaint to him against her.—Hutch. Hist. i. 459. Mr. Halkett, in his Notes on the N. American Indians, though disposed to make every allowance for the Puritans, distinctly says, "Enough may be gathered from them [their own historians] to satisfy every unprejudiced reader, that the Indians were treated by the Europeans with extreme injustice."—Notes, &c. p. 122.

It is remarkable, how some particulars in this department of their history, resemble, upon a smaller scale, some of the saddest scenes of the history of Europe. The parallel just drawn between the fate of a son of King Philip in Spain, and King Philip in Rhode Island, is painfully obvious.

And who can fail to see the similarity between the fates of King Charles I., and King Miantonimoh? Charles would never have suffered, let men denounce Cromwell as they choose, if the Puritan ministers had been as resolutely determined to save him, as the Presbyterian ministers (some of them) pretended, and affirmed, that they themselves were. But, as in days of yore, Gibbon testifies,* that "the Arian clergy surpassed in religious cruelty the king and his Vandals;" so here, the Puritan ministers seemed to inflict death with a hardihood from which the magistrates shrank. They advised, and urged, and virtually decreed the death of the noble Miantonimoh;† and worked the magistrates up to the fearful deed, by suggesting to them that the actual execution should take place out of their jurisdiction. They consented, provided "some discreet and faithfull persons" see the deed effectually done;‡ and a tomahawk was buried in Miantonimoh's brain, while he was journeying unsuspectingly as a prisoner.[130]

This version of the subject, Dr. Morse, with such candor as is found in other Puritan writers, repudiates; and glosses the matter over with the easy *ignoramus*, "I know of no foundation for this unfavorable representation of the

[130] See Note 130.

---

* Dec. and Fall. chap. 38; or vol vi. 273.

† The editor of Gorton says the secret of this clerical counsel is, that Miantonimoh gave shelter to the heretics of Massachusetts. There is verisimilitude in this, to say the least.—R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 155, 155. See also editor of Winthrop, Sav. Wint. ii. 133.—R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 39—43.

‡ Hazard's Collect. ii. 13.

affair."* But Dr. Trumbull is more candid, and admits it; and admits too the instrumentality of the ministers.† Other authorities may be found in my references;‡ and the following remark of the Hon. Mr. Savage clinches this matter and a hundred more: "Whenever any course that might proceed to a result of extreme injustice, cruelty, or tyranny, was contemplated by the civil rulers, the sanction of the churches, or of the elders, was usually solicited, and too often obtained."§ "The fate of Agag," as he elsewhere says, *then* "followed of course."|| The editor of Winthrop's journal could see this, with provoking plainness; but though the *first* edition of Winthrop's Journal was published in 1790, Dr. Morse could not find in it the shadow of a fact so ghastly. And the same blindness in part has happened unto Dr. Morse's Israel, both before and since.

I have remarked the parallels in the case of Philip's son, and Miantonimoh: the dismemberment and extermination of the Pequots, (a whole nation,) reminds one strongly of the fate of Poland. After the Pequots had been administered upon with bayonets, shot, and fire,¶ their women and children slaughtered, and their wigwams burnt, they were summoned (a wretched, shivering remnant) to Puritan head-quarters, to hear their final earthly doom. There were only about 180 remaining of this once powerful tribe.** "Then,"

* Morse's Geog. edit. 1792, p. 236.

† Trumbull's Connect. i. 133, 134.

‡ R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 155, 156. Allen's Dict. 581. Sav. Wint. ii. 131, 132. Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. ix. 202.

§ Sav. Wint. i. 284, note. || Ibid. ii. 133, note.

¶ Mr. Bacon says the war with the Pequots was "as righteous as ever was waged."—Discourses, p. 330. This is disputed.—R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 23.—Well does the editor of Winthrop say, "Savages are hardly tamed by kindness; never by severity."—Sav. Wint. i. 223, note.

** Vincent's narrative shows, how coolly and deliberately the extermination of the Pequots was resolved on, *after* their total defeat and rout. Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. vi. 39, 40.

adds the cool and minute Puritan annalist, "were there granted to *Uncas*, Sachem of Moheag, eighty, and to *Miantonimoh*, Sachem of Narragansett, eighty, and to *Ninnicraft* twenty men, when he should satisfy for a mare of Eltwood Pomeroy's, killed by some of his men."* Thus, in a single breath, a whole people are scattered to the winds, and a lost mare compounded for: no unapt illustration of Puritan mercilessness on the one hand, and shilling and penny exactitude on the other! And would that the latter feature, abounding and superabounding as it did, and still does, in PURITANIA, had here and always preponderated.—But the fell revenge which sold the Pequots into bondage, was not satiated. They "were by covenant bound, that they should no more inhabit their native country." Oh, how could they forget their own murmurs against those, who made their native country uninhabitable to themselves!—Yet they did, and added moreover the last drop to the cup of a homeless Pequot's misery. They denied him, and that forever, the very name of his forefathers.† And their charter, wanderers though they called themselves, gave them, the while, the name, the protection, and the freedom of Englishmen! Ah, if there are those against whom the pagans of Sodom and Gomorrah shall rise in judgment, may not some poor Pequots yet testify against those, who to-day bemoaned themselves as the victims of oppression, and to-morrow annihilated not the estates and the liberty only, but the very name of their own victims—swept them from the world, as with the besom of perdition.‡

The case of Philip, the king whose throne was on a

* Mather's Troubles, p. 39. R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 26.

† Drake's Old Indian Chronicle, p. 156.

‡ Pirates never were guilty of a bloodier deed, than the taking thirty Indians out in a boat, murdering them in cold blood, and then throwing their bodies overboard to be eaten by the monsters of the deep. Yet such was a Puritan revel, and a Puritan historian is merry over it; speaking of the boat that took them, as Charon's ferry-boat!—Drake's Book of the Indians, B. ii. 106.

mount miserably misnamed for *him*—Mount Hope—furnishes, some think, a fair apology for Puritan retributions. It were useless, therefore, for me to speak of it in my own language. I accordingly quote from a Puritan retrospective review, which preceded the North American: "Philip viewed them with jealousy, and for this was called a perfidious wretch.* Every epithet was applied to him, which the Roman writers apply to Hannibal or Jugurtha, or any barbarous prince, who fought in defence of his own country, or for a while kept his possessions from the mighty grasp of their iron hand. We here compare small things with great; but the sentiment applies to a savage warrior of these western regions, who made every effort to prolong the existence of his own nation. It was criminal in this man, as his enemies thought, to have a different religion; or not to fall in with their ideas of property, when they wanted his estate. [This clause refers aptly to my first head.] This might have been said if the Indians had had any friends to assert their claims; but their actions are recorded by those *who wished to make them odious.*"† A page or two onwards, the reviewer informs us, that Philip was hunted like a wild beast, that when shot his body was quartered and set upon poles, his head carried as a trophy to Plymouth, and his skull preserved as a curiosity for future generations! ‡ Cruel, cruel fate—even Mr. Felt is moved by it, and exclaims, "Could some historians of his own nation have described the principles of his policy, and the traits of his character, they would have presented him before us as one of the greatest heroes of his age.§

* Mr. Savage, however, hesitates not to accuse the Puritans, in the shocking case of Miantonimoh, of *both* perfidy and cruelty.—Sav. Wint. ii. 132, Note.

† Monthly Anthology, 1809, vol. vii. 415.

‡ Drake says that Philip's head was kept hanging for *twenty* years. —Book of the Indians, B. iii. p. 43.

§ Felt's Salem, p. 255. He is eloquent, too, over the sufferings and death of Sassacus, the chief of the Pequots, pp. 104, 105. "His patriotism," he says, "was of high order."

But it is impossible, in my limits, and quite needless for my purpose, for me to run into details of their relentless severity, whose *priests* could indite such counsels and such triumphs as these: "Happy shall he be that shall reward them, as they have served us, and cursed be he that shall do the work of the Lord negligently."*—"Happy were they that could bring in their heads [of the Pequots] to the English."—"For the Lord was pleased to smite our enemies in the hinder parts, and to give us their land for an inheritance; who remembered us in our low estate, and redeemed us out of our enemies' hands."† This is the pæan for the burning wigwams, and the expiring groans of the down-trodden savage. But the cries of the oppressed were louder in the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth; and the day of reckoning will come, if it have not come already. If a resurrection were to bring the generation of Ward and Mather from their graves, they would chant no pæan to find New England such as she is now.

I will quote but two authorities more; one to show that the direful disposition to revenge was so pervading in a Puritan breast, that it infected even the gentler sex, and could be restrained by no solemnity; another, to show that Puritanism itself, in a moment of candor, is shocked by the treatment of the Aborigines.

The first is from Hutchinson's History, and the second from Trumbull's; and the two are quite enough to set a seal upon stronger assertions than I have ventured upon, had I chosen to use them. "Mr. Increase Mather, in a letter to Mr. Cotton, 23d 5 mo. 1677, [for the Puritans were once Quakerish in their notions of dates,] ‡ mentions an instance of rage against two prisoners of the Eastern

* Ward's Cobbler of Agawam. New edit. p. 79.

† Mather's Troubles, pp. 38, 39, 41. Mather, in his Prevalency of Prayer, says they prayed the bullet into Philip's heart! p. 10.

‡ "In order not to denote the months as the [Roman] Catholics did." —Felt's Ipswich, pp. 21, 22.

Indians, then at Marblehead, a fishing town, which goes beyond any other I ever heard of. 'Sabbath day was se'n-night, the WOMEN at Marblehead as they came out of the meetinghouse, [no churches in those days,] fell upon two Indians that were brought in as captives, and in a tumultuous way very barbarously murdered them.'"* "Though the first planters of New England and Connecticut,"† says Trumbull, dragging Connecticut up to justice, when Dr. Bacon ‡ would fain whiten her every sin, "were men of eminent piety and strict morals; yet, like other good men, they were subject to misconception and the influence of passion. Their beheading sachems whom they took in war, killing the male captives, and enslaving the women and children of the Pequots, after it was finished, was treating them with a severity, which, on the benevolent principles of Christianity, it will be difficult ever to justify. The executing of all those as murderers, who were active in killing any of the English people, [when, as he admits, they did it in war, and under orders from their native prince,] and obliging all the Indian nations to bring in such persons, or their heads, was an act of severity unpractised, at this day, by civilized and Christian nations. The decapitation of their enemies, and the setting of their heads upon poles, was a kind of barbarous triumph, too nearly symbolizing with the examples of uncivilized and pagan nations."§

I have somewhere read, that one of the best possible methods to disabuse one's self of Socinian prejudices, would be to read the Gospel of St. John, all the while saying to one's self, "Such expressions as 'The Word was God'

* Hutchinson, i. 277, 278, note.

† Is not Connecticut a part of New England? Or is Dr. Trumbull shy of the fellowship?

‡ I have called him Mr. Bacon, as he has no title in the books quoted But the newspapers, I see, call him Doctor; and so honor to whom honor, &c.

§ Trumbull's Connect. i, 115. Also Note 131.

and 'The world was made by Him,' &c., &c., are asserted of a mere mortal like me." I know of no better method for disabusing one's self of a proclivity to laud Puritanism, and hate Episcopacy, than to read such passages as I have given in Puritan history, and as Trumbull alludes to, all the while saying to one's self, "These are the doings of 'men of eminent piety and strict morals,' of men, in fine, who thought themselves the ecclesiastical *nonpareils* of the world, whose threshold was God's threshold, whose post was *his* post, and whose altar was *his* altar—men from whom the most complete specimens of human virtue were to be looked for, who had pleaded for toleration and charity with all their might,* and fled to enjoy and to exemplify them, thousands and thousands of miles along the tumbling billows of the main."

Ah, how soon would such a reader cry out to his adviser, "You have beguiled me! These are not the deeds of Puritans—meek victims of 'Laudean persecution.' These are the foot-prints of the old 'Malignant Party' in sheep's clothing. Away with the supposition, that they who made the arches of heaven ring with their protests against oppression, could belie themselves so outrageously!"

But facts, as the adage goes, are stubborn things. Puritan history is entered upon an immutable record; for the past, Omnipotence itself cannot change. And it goes to swell the proof of the maxim, that truth itself is stranger than fiction. Puritanism in England, when denouncing the Church, if prophetically assured it would do worse than its opponents, no doubt would have answered, as Hazael did, Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing? But the future made Hazael worse, than he scorned to believe a possibility. And how did Puritanism fulfil its own boasts? The experience of the Churchman, and the Baptist, and the Quaker, and the Papist, and the Presbyterian, and the In-

* Edwards' Antapologia. p. 280, etc. Edwards, it must never be forgotten, is a Presbyterian!

dian, recorded on these pages, can answer. Sir Richard Saltonstall said its conduct laid it very low in the hearts of the saints in England; and Dr. Watts, that it made him blush for shame; while Baillie announces, with the solemnity of a fact, that the opinion of its more than ordinary piety had vanished.* And the proof is cumulative, if the answer must be lifted to a louder key. May Heaven grant that it be not necessary, and that the descendants of the Puritans, seeing how their forefathers proved themselves men of like passions with those whom they condemned, and seeing what they themselves are, split into intestine factions, may begin to stoop from their heights of pride, and learn the severest lesson which has ever been taught them; that they are no more pious in heart, no more orthodox in principle, no more benevolent in life, than the mass of Christians which surrounds them.†[132]

CONCLUSION.

And now, I suppose, the question will be asked, Having said all which one of the 'Malignant Party' *can* say to disparage the Puritans, are you going to part with them, and utter no words in their praise?‡

And my reply will be shorter, much shorter, than many may expect. In the first place, I have not shown myself un-

[132] See Note 132.

---

* Hutchinson's Collect. 401, 402. M. H. Coll. 1st ser. v. 201.—Baillie's Letters, edit. 1775, vol. i. 438.—Sir H. Vane's letter, an echo of Saltonstall's. Hutch. Collect. p. 137.

† Let the reader here compare the quotations from Dr. Owen, given in Note 43. Also from Milton, p. 5.

‡ Compare the latter part of Note 95.

ready to give praise, where praise is due. The Huguenots, Governor Winthrop, and Roger Williams, can testify for me on this point. I know no writer, alive or dead, who has eulogized Roger Williams for higher virtue, than my poor pen has ascribed to him. In the second place, I have as full faith in the piety, in the honesty, and in the Protestantism of Ap. Laud, as any descendant of the Puritans has, in the same qualities, as endowing and adorning the Cottons, the Wilsons, and the Mathers, of his ecclesiastical pedigree. And should I ever (though the day may about be despaired of) see that age of miracles, which produces Puritan authors (sermonizers, orators, reviewers, and song-writers) looking away from Laud's failings, and honoring his undoubted virtues, the example may so captivate me, that I may forget it is my duty to silence Puritan clamors by enumerating Puritan faults, and attempt a more grateful task in its congenial strain.

NOTES.

NOTE 1, p. 15.

There is a rock, I am told, in Rhode Island, famous as a stepping-stone, where Roger Williams disembarked from his canoe. But the Baptists have never made any noise about it, or it would have been notorious long ago.

NOTE 2, p. 15.

The writer was at this time (1835) resident in Massachusetts. It may answer the curiosity of some to know, who was the author of the tract to which reference is made just above; and I take this occasion to say, that it was "An Address delivered before the Pilgrim Society of Plymouth, December 22, 1834. By George W. Blagden." It was printed under the auspices of the "Trustees of the Pilgrim Society;" and thus became a sort of Pilgrim manifesto. And of so much consequence was it considered, as to be made the subject of a copy-right.

NOTE 3, p. 15.

This is stating the matter over-fairly for the Puritans. The band to which New England traces its religious history, did not come from their "native land;" but, be it never forgotten, from Holland, where they had lived quietly for eleven years, and might have lived quietly till their death, if their own uneasiness had not prevented. This is a link in the chain of Puritan history many would gladly leave out; for it is fatal to the argument that persecution compelled them to come hither. Were they persecuted out of *Holland?* That is the true question; and, by the fear of the ninth commandment, let them answer it honestly. I have no apprehension in that case; for, says Douglass, in his Summary, &c., "In Leyden to this day [1760], an English Presbyterian congregation is maintained in their works by the States. (Vol. i. 395, note.) This shows how false their fears, and how ungenerous their insinuations, that the Dutch might swallow them up. So complaisant are the Dutch, that 138

years after the departure of Robinson's congregation, which was looked upon as the nucleus of New England Puritanism, and the morning-star of its glory, they cherish that which remained and was thought ready to die. A formidable necessity truly, which constrained them to desert such obstinate friends!

NOTE 4, p. 16.

The very Charter obtained of Charles I., in 1629, a few years after the landing at Plymouth, shows on the face of it, that they were not persecuted out of England, and that they left England as "adventurers" to convert the Indians!

For, in the first place, how inexplicably queer it is, to suppose that they whom the Government drave out by violence, should have succeeded in obtaining from that very Government a charter, which clothed them (according to their own interpretation of it, and action under it) with all the powers and honors of a new independent state! Could Huguenots have obtained a thousandth part of such grace from Louis XIV.?

And in the next place, the Charter itself says expressly, that they were clothed with corporate powers, so as to "win and incite the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind, and the Christian faith; WHICH IN OUR ROYAL INTENTION, AND THE ADVENTURERS' FREE PROFESSION, IS THE PRINCIPAL END OF THIS PLANTATION." (Ancient Colony Laws, pp. 14, 15.) Now, unless the Puritans tricked the King, they were missionary adventurers, and not persecuted pilgrims, by their own "free profession." But Charles is represented as greatly reverencing religion; and perhaps they did induce him to believe they wanted nothing but the conversion of the wretched heathen.—The more worldly King Jamie understood them better. When they asked *him* for a charter, under the same pretence, he inquired carefully "What profits might arise." And it was answered, with a bluntness like his own, "Fishing." (Young's Chronicles, pp. 382, 383.) And that these "fishing" profits were not thought lightly of, is evident from the fact, that in the year the Puritans landed, no less than 35 vessels visited the coast of New England for them, "from the West of England," and in the next year 40. In addition to which, Canada and New England shipped off, in six years of the same era, 20,000 beaver skins (Douglass' Summary, i. 395, 396.) Truly, the icy seas and howling wilds of North America must, even as early as 1620, have filled some pockets very comfortably.*

* Compare Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. viii. 95. Oldmixon, i. 44. Trumbull's U. S. p. 72.

Yet, say the advocates of the Puritans, they did not grow rich, but continued poor and suffering. Well, and whose fault was that? That they expected to grow rich is incontestable, from the confession of one of their own number—Dudley. He thus wrote home in 1631: "If any comes to this settlement to plant for worldly ends, (but if for spiritual he may do well,) that can live well at home, he commits an error of which he will soon repent him; WE FAILED OF OUR EXPECTATION, TO OUR GREAT DAMAGE." (Douglass' Summary, i. 426, note. Compare Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. viii. 42.) So here two formidable facts leak out. Multitudes were coming over for worldly ends, and he wrote to stop them!—But the reason, alas! the reason. Why, we failed in the success we counted on, and so beware: you may be disappointed also, to the "great damage"—of what? Of your souls? Nay, but of your purses!

NOTE 5, p. 17.

There is a technical inaccuracy here, which, however, redounds not to Puritan credit, but rather the contrary. The charter under which they first acted was the charter of the Plymouth Council in England; and it is from this, and not from the charter of 1629, (obtained after they had left England,) that the quotations in the text come. Those expressions seem quite strong enough; but of course the charter of 1629 was esteemed better and stronger, or they would have had nothing to do with it. The real secret was, that the charter of 1629 made them, as they supposed, independent; and independence of all control, in order to carry out their own favorite measures, was the darling object of their ambition. They could not accomplish that, any better in Holland than in England; and so they left the one as readily as they did the other. "Disregarding equally her charter," says Chalmers in his Annals, "and the laws of England, Massachusetts established for herself an independent government, extremely similar to those of the Grecian colonies." (Annals, p. 682; also, pp. 177, 178.) Nay, such a favorite idea was this independence, that it was exemplified largely during the CIVIL WARS; showing that it was not freedom of conscience which was wanted, so much as sovereignty. (Chalmers, 181. Gordon's Am. Rev., i. 27, 28, London edit. 1778. Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, iii. 84.)

NOTE 6, p. 18.

The celebrated farewell letter, which may be found in the appendix to the first volume of Hutchinson's Massachusetts, is abundant proof of this; but it may be well enough to add something from Robinson's own lips. Robinson went over to Holland with his congregation, "one of the most

rigid separatists from the Church of England." (Belknap's Biog., ii. 161.) But, as Belknap shows, he became more moderate, disavowed the name of Brownist, taught his followers to do so, and finally proclaimed such sentiments as these: "For myself, thus I believe with my heart, and profess with my tongue, and have before the world, that I have one and the same faith, hope, spirit, baptism, and Lord, which I had in the Church of England, and none other; that I esteem so many in that Church, of what state or order soever, as are truly partakers of that faith, (as I account many thousands to be,) for my Christian brethren, and myself a fellow-member with them of that one mystical body of Christ, scattered far and wide throughout the world." (Young's Chronicles, pp. 400, 401.)

So, then, the model-Puritans drew nearer and nearer to the Church of England, instead of departing further and further from it; and if their followers in New England did not imitate them in their later and cooler days, those followers should never quote them as their progenitors. Is there one in "many thousands" of our New England Puritans, who would now say, after Robinson, "I have one and the same faith, hope, spirit, baptism, and Lord, which my fathers had in the Church of England, and NONE OTHER?" I fear not; in spite of Mr. Professor Kingsley's just rebuke to all, "who do not feel a reverence for the Church of England." (Historical Discourse, p. 55.)

NOTE 7, p. 19.

"But this colony received its principal assistance from the discontent of several GREAT MEN of the Puritan party, who were its protectors, and who entertained a design of settling amongst them in New England, if they should fail in the measures they were pursuing for establishing the liberty and reforming the religion of their mother country." (European Settlements, ii. 140. Oldmixon, i. 67.) This illustrates, clearly, the connexion between the Puritans in New England, and politicians of *eminence* at home. It shows, too, that New England was not so much as dreamed of for a residence, by the chief men of the Puritan party, unless they should fail in their revolutionary schemes. It was a dernier resort, and nothing more—a city of refuge, to escape the avenger of blood, and that was all. Like Cæsar, the Puritan politicians were determined to be *first* in the village, rather than *second* at Rome; and so, if they could not overturn the English monarchy, they would start a republic beyond the Atlantic.

The quotation shows, too, that, as a thousand times before, designing politicians made religious fanaticism a tool to work their own ends. Little did many a simple-minded zealot, whose enthusiasm kept him

warm amid the snows of New England—little did he dream, that he was but the servitor of the crafty great at home. But it was even so. They burned incense unto his drag, and then put their hook into his nose. (Collier's Ecc. Hist., vi. 436. or, ii. 508.) Hetherington (a Presbyterian) says, Cromwell played off this game on the Independents, i. e. Congregationalists. (Hist. Westmin. Assembly, p. 198.)

NOTE 8, p. 19.

Gordon, a Puritan himself and a minister, freely admits and condemns the union of Church and State, attempted and effected "so early," he says, "as the second General Court;" i. e. in May, 1631. (Gordon's Am. Rev. i. 29.) In a few years, even the words "established religion," which were so terrible and infamous in England, became virtually as familiar as household words in New England! An act against heresy in 1658, speaks undisguisedly and plumply of "the order established in Church and Commonwealth." (Ancient Colony Laws, p. 124.) Probably, the fact that the Puritan religion was established by law, in both Massachusetts and Connecticut, will not now be very pugnaciously denied. But it may be interesting to the curious, to know what put an end to its establishment in Massachusetts, in 1834. The law gave to the *first* Congregational society in each town a pecuniary pre-eminence. The odds and ends, the taxes of all the stragglers, nothingarians, and infidels, went *there*. But the Unitarians, some how or other, contrived to get a good many of these *first* societies into their hands; and thus "brought no small gain unto" their "craftsmen," from the laws supporting religion. This the Calvinists could not complacently endure; and so they determined to defeat the Unitarians, by raising a hue and cry with the Universalists, infidels, &c., against the cruelty of making a man pay for a religion which his conscience did not approve of. The contest, to a philosophical observer, was singular enough. Here were Predestinarians, who would doom multitudes to a hopeless hereafter, contending for their pecuniary emancipation now. While the Unitarians, (who do not differ essentially from Universalists about future punishment—at the worst believing only in a sort of Purgatory,) were contending as resolutely for their pecuniary thraldom. And then the secret motive on both sides—nothing but an offshoot of the old love of "exclusive property in soil!"

NOTE 9, p. 19.

The Puritans, says Chandler, "used worse severities towards others for conscience' sake, than what they themselves had experienced from

the bitterest of their enemies;* and thereby made it appear, that they complained against the persecutions of the prelatical party; not because they were for moderation and Christian charity in their own conduct, but because they thought the right of persecution only in themselves, and that violence ought not to be made use of to support any but the orthodox opinions of such as they themselves esteemed to be godly, and to maintain what they called the order and fellowship of their own churches." (Chandler on Persecution, p. 402. London, 1736. Compare Hewatt's South Carolina, i. pp. 33, 34.)

NOTE 10, p. 20.

"The same demon," says O'Leary, another testifier from a different school, that my readers may see how people from various points of observation have seen the same melancholy spectacle—"The same demon that poured the poisonous cup over the kingdoms and provinces of Europe, took his flight over the Atlantic, and spread his baneful influence amongst colonists who had themselves fled from the scourge. Their new-built cities, like so many Jerusalems, were purified from idolatry. There, no Popish priest dared to bend his knee to 'his idols, or to transfer to stock or stone the worship due to the God of Israel.' There, the Quaker woman's silent groans were raised on the high key of loud shrieks, when the Lord's deputy ordered her profane breasts to be whipped off by the Gospel scourge, that whipped the profaners out of the temple. There, the Quaker was seen suspended by the neck on high, for daring to pollute the sacred streets with his profane feet, *moved by Baal's spirit.*" (O'Leary's Tracts, 3d ed. p. 316.)

NOTE 11, p. 20.

"How easy and plain might we make our defence, how clear and allowable even unto them, if we could but obtain of them to admit the same things consonant unto equity in our mouths, which they require to be so taken from their own! If that which is truth, being uttered in maintenance of Scotland or Geneva, do not cease to be truth when the Church of England once allegeth it, this great crime of 'Tyranny' wherewith we are charged hath a plain and an easy defence." (Hooker's Ecc. Polity, Hanbury's edit., iii., 166; or, B. vii., Sect. 14.) Adjust the matter on Hooker's claim for an impartial hearing, and the voice of a Puritan against Laud and Charles I. would be silenced forever. For

* This will do as an offset to Prof. Kingsley, who undertakes to show, (carefully quoting but one side,) that England and Virginia were severer than the Puritans.—Hist. Disc. pp. 48, 49.

example, a Presbyterian shows how the Puritans made it a sufficient excuse, to say they punished *ecclesiastical* crimes because they were *civil* ones. (Edwards' Antapologia, pp. 165, 166.) But if this excuses the Puritans, then why not Churchmen too?

NOTE 12, p. 20.

See Hutchinson's Massachusetts, i. 26, 398, note; Snow's History of Boston, p. 52. A multitude more of references could be given, if necessary. The Puritans did not escape authority by flying from bishops: they only submitted to twenty bishops, where before they had one. Well did Melancthon say, after some such experience as youthful Boston supplied, "I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of bishops; for I see what manner of Church we shall have, the ecclesiastical policy being dissolved. I foresee that hereafter there will be a much more intolerable tyranny than there ever was before." (Worgan on the Reformation, pp. 202, 203.*) Hooker, also, complains of the consequences of cheapening the ministry, and exalting the brethren in his day. (Hanbury's Hooker, iii. 191, 241.) But a better authority than all, with some, will be the testimony given by Bissland on the Preaching of the Cross, pp. 97, 98, note. "It is frequently admitted," he says, "by dissenting teachers, that the interference of the leading members of their congregation is sometimes intolerable, and that they are in as much bondage to some wealthy, though perhaps ignorant layman, as if he claimed the infallibility of the Pope. No one can speak more strongly on this subject, than Mr. J. A. James of Birmingham; and probably no man is better qualified to speak upon it. 'What is the deacon of some of our dissenting communities? The patron of the living, the Bible of the minister, and the wolf of the flock. . . . . In many of our churches, the pastor is depressed far below his level. . . . . His opinion is received with no deference, his person is treated with no respect; and in the presence of some of his lay tyrants . . . . . he is only permitted to peep and mutter in the dust.'" "There never was a difficulty," said a suffering Puritan minister, "but there was a deacon in it." And even Mr. Mitchell is obliged to acknowledge this half true. (Church Member, p. 134.)

NOTE 13, p. 21.

Dr. Hawks, the author alluded to, puts rather a different face upon the mission to Virginia, by saying it was requested by residents in Virginia

* So Lord Digby warned them. "I am confident that instead of every Bishop we put down in a Diocese, we shall set up a Pope in every parish." (Rushworth's Collections, iv. 174.) This was in 1640.

itself. (Hawks' Virginia, p. 51.*) Most cheerfully, therefore, would I abandon the paragraph, as *one* blot effaced from the Puritan escutcheon. But it unfortunately happens, that the application was made the year poor Ap. Laud was committed to the Tower, and was answered the next year, when it was clearly seen, no doubt, that he would never go out of prison but to his grave. That was indeed a most auspicious moment to make an inroad on a loyal colony, which, in their view and language, was "the region and shadow of death." (Mather's Magnalia, i. 538.) And, too, I can never forget their excessive testiness about Episcopal missions, so late as the days of Mayhew and Apthorp, more than a century afterwards. Such a people had scanty reason for complaining, that they were treated themselves, as they would treat others. Had their ministers, instead of having "little encouragement from the rulers," been treated as they themselves began to treat the Quakers, when they found it necessary to moderate their severity, they would have been whipped through but *three towns*, instead of from end to end of the Commonwealth. It is an actual fact, that a Puritan statute against the Quakers decreed, as a condescension, that they should be whipped "but through three towns"! This was in 1661, when Charles II. had forbidden hanging and boring with a red hot iron. This was the way in which Puritan mercies became tender. (See Ancient Col. Laws, p. 126. Hutchinson's Hist. i. 188. Wynne's America, i. 80. Oldmixon's British Empire in America, i. 108.)

NOTE 14, p. 22.

When this was written, I had not seen Prof. Knowles' Life of Roger Williams. He disputes the claim of the Romanists, and I must think successfully. (Life, p. 371, &c.) Maryland tolerated Christians and Trinitarians *only*;† and even passed a law in 1649, mulcting all who should speak reproachfully against the Blessed Virgin, or the Apostles.‡ (Gordon's America, i. 68, edit. 1788.) Mr. Knowles correctly says, such a provision might be made a terrible engine of persecution; for a Protestant might say, e. g. that the Virgin Mary should not be worshipped, and that would be a dismal reproach to her, in the eye of a Papist. But Roger Williams, he says, granted toleration to every body.§ The palm

* On the 52d page, however, he half takes this back, by showing that the mission was probably suggested by Puritan emigrants.

† N. B. When Puritans had sway in Maryland, in Cromwell's day, a persecuting law was passed against Romanists and Episcopalians also! The contrast is most expressive. (Bozman's Maryland, 170, 171.)

‡ The Law of 1649, threatened Anti-Trinitarians with death. Bancroft, i. 256.

§ In Upham's life of Vane, in Sparks' Am. Biog., the priority appears to be claimed for Sir Harry Vane, as an assertor of liberty of conscience. See pp. 155, 156, 204.

in peerless charity might therefore be assigned to him; but unfortunately this apostle of universal good-will is found selling Indians into slavery! Mr. Knowles mourns over him, (Life, p. 348,) and well he may; and, on the whole, both the plea for him and the Romanists, must be taken with some abatement. Detract from it, however, never so much; and yet how transcendently superior are Baptists and Papists to Puritans, for they sometimes would not hear one another! One Mr. Hobart, who had a little of that energy and dauntlessness which afterwards shone so conspicuously in a *bishop*, who, as Tudor says in his Life of Otis, p. 497, was his descendant, was positively and peremptorily forbidden by the magistrates to preach in Boston, because, alas! "*he was a bold man, and would speak his mind.*" This was bad enough; but Mr. Hobart capped the climax when he "managed all affairs without advice of the brethren"!! That fixed his fate, and the Boston Inquisition put their seal upon his lips, as if like Darius they were fastening the den of lions. (See Young's Chronicles, p. 402, notes. Sav. Wint. ii. 313.) • Cotton Mather says he was a determined foe to those, who were "furiously set upon having all things carried *their* way, which they would call *the* rule." (Magnalia, i. 450.) Of course such a man was an uncomfortable neighbor to Puritan autocrats, such as Mather alludes to.

NOTE 15, p. 26.

To Puritanism also, says Dean Swift, England, by a sort of *vice versa* rule, has been indebted for Popery. Puritanism drove the children of Charles I. into exile, "where one of them at least, I mean King James II., was seduced to Popery; which ended in the loss of his kingdoms, the misery and desolation of this country, and a long and expensive war abroad." (Swift's Works, xiv. 73, 12mo edit. London, 1803.) This will be a new way, to some, of accounting for the semi-popery (as the Puritans believed) of Charles I., and the thorough Popery of James II. But the Dean had a very common sense way of looking at facts, as well as of expressing his opinions. His observation is worthy no small deference.

And certainly, if Roger Williams had aught to do with the exception of Roman Catholics, in the Rhode Island statute of March 1663, he could hardly be deemed a consistent assertor of the doctrine. See foot-note upon this subject, in Letter XVI, on the Papists; and the Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. v. 243, 244, which prove incontestably the existence of the statute alluded to.—See Mr. Hallam's opinion on this subject. Introd. to Literature, iii. 61, Paris edit. 1839. Mr. Hallam seems not to have been aware of the existence of Roger Williams, and gives the palm, on the whole, to the Arminians. This is worth noting, when we remember that Ap. Laud was considered a strong Arminian!

NOTE 16, p. 28.

Briscoe's letter from England, in October, 1652, fully confirms Laud's prediction. He thus writes to his son-in-law, at Boston, Massachusetts: "They make themselves rich, and that is all they do. King's lands, and bishops', deans' and delinquents' lands, sold; and debts not paid, but very few; nor heavy burdens taken off. I could write a great deal more to you of the carriage of things, *but dare not*. Those that went to Holland in the bishops' days, as Thomas Goodwin, Nye, and Simson, &c., will prove as great persecutors as the bishops." (Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. i. 33.) One would think Briscoe's *actual* description bad enough; but we see his *possible* description might have been tremendous. Doubtless, however, he remembered the awful fate of Christopher Love in 1651, (I shall allude to Love in the seventeenth Letter,) and so was cautious.—It might have cost him his liberty, if not his life, to be too plain.

His caution was provident. The letter was ferreted out in Boston, and, by order of the *Legislature*, sent back to England. This confirms the statement of Chalmers, about the intermeddling of Massachusetts with private correspondence. (Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d ser. i. 35. Chalmers' Annals, pp. 146, 148, 149.)

NOTE 17, p. 30.

This is exquisite indeed: a text from the Apocrypha, to fortify Puritans in denouncing the Church of England as ANTICHRIST! Why, one of their sternest objections to the Liturgy was, that it allowed apocryphal lessons to be read in divine service; though some of those lessons were purposely read on such days as Papists would over-magnify, (days commemorative e. g. of the Virgin Mary,) in order that the Church might manifest no undue deference towards them, and give the world to understand she regarded them as days of human and not of divine appointment. (Shepherd's Elucidation, i. 178. Rowe on the Rubric, p. 40.) Nevertheless, when it was desirable to prove such a damnatory doctrine as Milton's, (viz. "Nor is there any thing that hath more marks of schism and sectarism, than English Episcopacy:" Milton's Prose Works, p. 310. Lond. 1838,) and so justify entire separation from the Church of England—oh, then, the Apocrypha is capital and resistless authority!—Touch no such unclean thing as the Church of England, says the Apocrypha; and every Puritan shall say *Amen*.

NOTE 18, p. 31.

This expression of the oath is worthy the closest observation. It establishes, conclusively, what has been said again and again, and as often

denied. "Moreover I have NOW joined myself to the Church of Christ." Of course the swearer thereby virtually admits and asserts that he was never in the Church of Christ before: a position which is abundantly strengthened by what is avowed below, that to go back and join the Church of England would be to join ANTICHRIST. It has often and often been said, and denied, that the Puritans maintained the Church of England to be no Church at all, and as, therefore, a lawful subject for utter demolition. Let their oath of conspiracy now settle the question. Let not such concessions as Robinson's,* on the eve of the expedition in the Mayflower, or the farewell letter signed by Winthrop, &c., "aboord the Arbella," be interpreted as signifying quite other views. The expression of such views *then*, shows rather that *once* they thought otherwise, and now relented. But the relentings of a few are not the retrogression of all.

NOTE 19, p. 32,

"It must be further observed, that all these attempts have been made under the old outcries and noise of *Popery;* which, when loudest and most clamorous, is as sure a sign of some violent assault from *Presbytery*, as a ruffian's endeavoring to divert your eyes from himself, betokens his intention of stabbing you in the back."—Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy, Pref. p. x.

NOTE 20, p. 32.

"All popular factions," says L'Estrange, who lived in the midst of the turbulent days of the Puritans, "take the Church in their way to the State." (Holy Cheat, p. 170.) But Bishop Pilkington describes the whole process most graphically. "The disputes which began about the vestments were now carried further, even to the whole constitution.—Pious persons lamented this, atheists laughed, and the Papists blew the coals; and the blame of all was cast upon the bishops." (Lathbury, 49. Maddox, 181.) Yet, as Neal and Fuller testify, Bishop Pilkington "was always a very great friend and favorer of the non-conformists," and "a conniver" at their delinquencies—in other words, half a Puritan himself. (Neal, i. 357. Fuller, ii. 513.) Pilkington's testimony, therefore, is peculiarly valuable.

* And after all, what does Robinson's concession (so often quoted) amount to? Simply to this, that the Ministers of the Church of England might be listened to, when they preached. He renounced the communion, sacraments and ordination of the Church of England, as stiffly as ever. A huge concession indeed!

NOTE 21, p. 33.

Mr. Bacon, who believes in the virtue of hard names, calls King James "a low-minded, vainglorious, pedantic fool." (Hist. Discourses, p. 9.)* But he showed no folly in his argument about the motto, "No bishop, no king." His speech, referred to in Fuller, shows how *he* understood it. Here is a Churchman's familiar explanation of it, at another day. "By *no bishop, no king*, is not intended that bishops are the props of royalty, nor do Episcopalians understand it so: but that both one and the other are objects of the same fury; only the Church goes first."—(L'Estrange's Holy Cheat, p. 170.)

James might well feel suspicious of the ulterior aims of the Puritans, and their recklessness of means to accomplish them. They professed to hate Elizabeth; yet, (as I shall have to say a second time,) they provoked her to the darkest deed of all her reign. "No persons were more strenuous than the Puritans, in their endeavors to bring the Queen of Scots to the scaffold." (Shorts' Ch. Hist. i. 443.)

NOTE 22, p. 35.

Ross, another Presbyterian, enumerates one hundred and six heresies,† which grew up on the soil of Independency after good wholesome Presbyterianism was pushed away; and adds, "these are some of the poysonous weeds, which have (too much of late) infested our English garden; I mean the Church once admired (both at home and abroad) for the beauty of her doctrine and discipline, and envied by none but Ignorants and men of perverse minds." (Ross's Views of all Religions, 5th ed. 1675, pp. 426, 427.) ‡ The Edinburgh Review says the tricks of the Independents were remembered and paid off, when the question of Charles II.'s Restoration came up. "The Presbyterians, in their eagerness to be revenged on the Independents, sacrificed their own liberty, and deserted all their old principles. Without casting one glance on the past, or requiring one stipulation for the future, they threw down their freedom at the feet of the most frivolous and heartless of tyrants." (Select. Ed. Rev. ii. 57. Paris, 1835.) Such were the fraternal interchanges between old-school and

* D'Israeli, a somewhat more competent judge, forms a very different opinion of King James' character, and says he has been wronged.—Curiosities of Literature, ii. 240, 242. Boston edit. 1833.

† Edwards in his Gangraena, Pt. i. 15, and Pt. iii. pp. 1, 116, says *two hundred and ten!* Morse says *more than eighty* were soon engendered by it on the soil of New England!—Geography, p. 185.

‡ Compare Bastwick's dismal confirmation of this, in his "Second part of Independency." Quoted in Baillie's Dissuasive, p. 95. Prelacy cut Bastwick's ears off; yet Puritanism in its genuine form, was, notwithstanding, a dose he could not swallow.

new-school, in days long forgotten. Can modern Philadelphia furnish us with any similar "beauties of history?"

NOTE 23, p. 35.

Wilson, one of their own historians, admits, says the Quarterly Review (vol. x. 91), "How the EARLIEST dissenters held 'that the constitution of the hierarchy was too bad to be mended; that the very pillars of it were rotten; that the structure ought to be raised anew; and that they were resolved to lay a new foundation, though it were at the hazard of all that was dear to them in the world.' 'Their chief error,' he says, 'seems to have been their uncharitableness in *unchurching* the whole Christian world except themselves.'" O remember this, ye who talk about unchurching, bigoted, Episcopalians!

NOTE 24, p. 36.

"They" (i. e. the *political* Puritans) says the Edinburgh Review, "seem to have borne some resemblance to the Brissotines of the French Revolution. But it is not very easy to draw the line of distinction between them and their devout associates; whose tone and manner they sometimes found it convenient to affect, and sometimes, it is probable, imperceptibly adopted." (Select. Edin. Rev. ii. 60.) This much too, be it remembered, when this Review sympathized with them politically.

Now for an authority from the Quarterly, in respect to the influence of the clergy, and the ease with which they learned their lessons; and as it states a *fact*, its testimony may be taken in full latitude. "Cromwell would have remitted the barbarous punishment to which he [James Naylor, a fanatic] was condemned; but the public preachers, Caryl, Manton, Nye, Griffith, and Reynolds, were as inexorable as so many Dominican friars; and like all punishments in those days, it was inflicted with the utmost rigor of inhumanity." (Quart. Rev. x. 107.)

NOTE 25, p. 38.

Mr. Lathbury is a very clear-headed and dispassionate writer, who refutes Neal, &c., in the quietest way imaginable. I wish his octavo of only 363 leaded pages could be reprinted. If done by any one, let him by no means forget a good index, which the English copy wants. An extensive index would double the book's value.

NOTE 26, p. 38.

Neal's own words are, as quoted, "a rigid Brownist." Belknap "mollified" the "relation" a little, and said, "rigid in his separation from

the Episcopal Church." Neal's knuckles were dealt so faithfully with by Dr. Watts, that when he wrote *afterwards* the history of the Puritans in England, they guided his pen more astutely. The history of New England appeared in 1720; the first volume of the history of the Puritans appeared in 1732. The mollification *there* is all on the right side, and Neal's character, accordingly, is fully recovered by Puritanic admeasurement. He is not quite "unimpeachable," however, with Presbyterians, except when he abuses Churchmen. When he touches the scar of an old Presbyterian wound, there is some wincing, as we see even at this day. "Indeed," says Hetherington, "the whole of Neal's statement respecting the conduct of the Presbyterians is so warped and biassed by prejudice, that it presents a very unfair view, not only of their characters, but even of the *facts* that occurred, in which they bore a leading part." (Hist. West. Assembly, p. 231.) On p. 245, he says that the authority of Neal is "by no means unimpeachable."*

NOTE 27, p. 38.

The change in Robinson himself was not much of a regeneration, according to Neal. "His adversaries," he says, "called him a *Semi-Separatist;* because he allowed of communion with other reformed churches in the word and prayer, but *not* in the Sacraments and discipline." (Neal's N. Eng. i. 110, 111.) As to Robinson's congregation, the unmollifying historian doggedly adds, (vol. i. 116,) "Tis certain, however, they were too much attached to some of the *Brownistical* Principles, which *Mr. Robinson*, if he had lived, would have weaned them from, and particularly *to the Preachings of the Gifted Brethren.*" The italics are Neal's own; and if there be a faint sneer in them at the "Gifted Brethren," I hope it will be duly pardoned.

Robinson stands higher with the descendants of the "Pilgrims," than almost any one; but I cannot see why even *they* should canonize him. Here, in 1620, we find him repudiating the name of Brownist, and yet in 1619, (but *the year before,* such is the date in Watt's Bibliotheca, and Mr. Young admits it, page 40 of his Chronicles,) he publishes his solemn apology for Brownism! This was published in English, says Mr. Young, in 1644; but Watt says in 1625; and, if so, very possibly during Robinson's life, and by himself! † These things look curious, and tally

* For a very strong Protestant's opinion respecting Neal, take the following: "No one who looks for truth will trust the historian of the Puritans alone, from one sentence to another."—Mendham's Pius V. p. 159, notes.

† Since writing this, I have seen Punchard's History of Congregationalism, p. 344; from which it appears that Robinson's Apology for Brownism was translated *by himself*, and published in 1625. So my conjecture was true!

poorly with the lofty compliment, that Robinson "was never satisfied in himself, until he had searched any cause or argument he had to deal in, thoroughly, and to the bottom." (Young's Chron. 452.) Was he such, and did he do so, in very deed? Then the Church of England should have suffered less from him; for he was once a beneficed clergyman within her pale, and might have paused, longer than he did, ere he renounced her as very Antichrist: which was one of the distinct positions of the Brownists. (See the letter prefacing Bp. Hall's Apology against the Brownists, which was an answer to one of Robinson's pamphlets, where he alludes to the abusive violence of Robinson; and see also his Epistle to him and Smith, Decade third, letter first.) But behold, after Robinson's decease, a treatise is found in his study on the lawfulness of hearing the ministers of the Church of England! (Young, 400).

So then, this profound and thorough gentleman begins by swearing allegiance to the Church of England; he next casts upon her "the blasphemous imputations of apostasy, antichristianism, whoredom, and rebellion;" (see Bp. Hall's prefatory letter;*) he then defends Brownism; he then disowns it; he then defends it for a second time; and finally closes the scene, by saying, "I have one and the same faith, hope, spirit, baptism, and Lord, which I had in the Church of England, and NONE OTHER."†

I am willing to take his dying testimony, and believe that, on the whole, this was the reason, and not want of money, as Mr. Young suggests, (p. 453,) which kept him from following the "pilgrims" to New England. There has always hung a mystery around Robinson's shrink-

* Robinson deserved small allowance for his own motives, for he was in the habit of blackening the motives of clergymen. He used to tell his people, that *many* of those who preached against them, and wrote against them, if they were where they dare be honest, would be just like themselves.—Hazard's Collect. i. 357.

† An unfortunate Churchman, to try to soothe a Puritan in New England, told him they had the same religion, Gospel, and hope. And what was the reply? See how sharp and trenchant. "What," he says, to his own friends, "renounce your communion, church-government, and some of your essential doctrines, too, and yet hold the same religion with you!—Again, Is it the same religion, Gospel, and hope?"—See a reply to a letter of a Church of England minister to his dissenting parishioners. Boston, 1736, p. 17.

Now Robinson could talk in the same way, this poor Churchman did, and it was all right—all an exhibition of famous charity. The moment a Churchman begins to talk so, a Puritan cleaves him to the very chine.

I cannot say, however, he did not serve him quite right. And I commend the case, and its issue, to those of my brethren who think it best to tell anti-Episcopalians how slightly they differ from them, how much they love them, &c. They get not a particle of credit for this extra charity. They only get a back-blow. 'Why, then, are you not like *us*, not almost, but altogether?'—May they learn a little wisdom by caustic experience.

ing delay, for five long years in Holland.* He was not an old man: he died at the age of fifty only, and was in the prime, doubtless, of his vigor. And he alone want money, when a whole shipload of inferior persons found it? And this, too, when as Neal says, his presence was indispensable to wean them from Brownism, and silence the too free effusions of the Gifted Brethren? *Credat Judæus*, &c. No: his confidence in Puritanism began to shake, and his attachment to the Church of England to revive. A few years more would have sufficed to make him follow Brown's steps, and go home to his spiritual mother. I cannot but believe, too, that the words of Bp. Hall † rang in his ears, in the loneliness of that study where he again inclined to think her preaching lawful; and that, "ungenerous" as Mr. Young pleases to pronounce them, (Chron. p. 453,) they touched a heart which had learned to repent of its hostility, to remember its first love, and to consider by whose bread its youth had been *nourished*. As the words may not be accessible to many, I will quote them, and close this protracted note. "Must God be accused of your wilfulness? Before that God, and his blessed angels and saints, we fear not to protest, that we are undoubtedly persuaded, that whosoever wilfully forsake the communion, government, ministry, or worship of the Church of England, are enemies to the sceptre of Christ, and rebels against his Church and Anointed: neither doubt we to say, that the Mastership of the Hospital at Norwich, or a lease from that city (sued for with repulse) might have procured, that this separation from the communion, government, and worship of the Church of England should not have been made by John Robinson."—Hall's Works, x. 113. Oxford ed. 1837.

NOTE 28, p. 41.

Perhaps I ought to qualify this, which is stronger language than Neal himself dare use. He says "the little army of confessors," (vol. iv. pref. p. iv.,) and so the little army of confessors let it be.

* There can be no great harm, for yet another reason, in suspecting Robinson's motives; for he suspected his own brethren at Plymouth. He said they did not want him there; because he would stop lay-preaching! So even they suspected he was getting to be too high a churchmam! All this is clear from his own letter. —Hazard's Coll. i. 372.—Mr. Young in his Chronicles, p. 476, inclines to the supposition, that the Rev. Mr. Lyford, &c. were opposed to Robinson's coming. But if the "Gifted Brethren" had not advanced high pretensions, why does Robinson's letter forbid a layman's administering sacraments?

† It is remarkable that Bishop Hall quoted to him his own colleague's words, when Robinson shrank from the lengths to which he went. "He tells you true: your station is unsafe: either you must forward to him, or back to us."—Hall, x. 9. —No doubt these words lodged in Robinson's memory, very deeply.

NOTE 29, p. 41.

That Episcopacy was detested by the Puritans more than Popery, is clear from the Gangraena of Edwards. Here are two of the positions which he ascribes to the Independents, i. e. the Congregationalists, or tip-top Puritans, who professed what he called "Brownism refined."

"That the Church of England and the ministry thereof is Antichristian, yea of the Devil, and that it is absolutely sinful and unlawful to hear any of their ministers preach in their assemblies."

"That the Church of Rome was *once* a true Church, but so was the Church of England *never;* therefore it is likelier the Church of Rome should be in the right, in the doctrines of free-will, universal redemption, original sin, &c., than the Church of England." (Gangraena, Pt. i. p. 25. Compare p. 12.)

NOTE 30, p. 41.

The character of Neal is thus given by Mosheim, who, being neither Churchman nor Puritan, may be accounted an impartial critic. "While he relates in the most circumstantial manner all the injuries the *Puritans* received from the bishops, and those of the established religion, he in many places diminishes, excuses, or suppresses, the faults and failings of these separatists." (Maclaine's Mosheim, iv. 379.) It is remarkable that Dr. Murdock, himself an Independent, should give this sentence even more edge in his translation. "While he is full in narrating and emblazoning the wrongs which the bishops inflicted, or caused to be inflicted on the Puritans, he frequently extenuates, excuses, or passes silently over, the faults of the *Puritan* sect." (Murdock's Mosh. iii. 201.)

NOTE 31, p. 42.

"Neal states that, in 1573, three hundred were deprived in the diocese of Norwich alone; whereas Strype mentions only three." (Lathbury, 50. Maddox Vind. 340. Compare Neal, i. 320.)

NOTE 32, p. 49.

The government were gentle enough to those who took the advice, that the Puritan historian Hubbard thought proper to give all who dissented from his New England establishment.

"However, it were well if all those who cannot comply with the religion of the State and place where they live, yet had so much manners as not to jostle against it, nor openly practice that that is inconsistent therewith, as if they would bid a kind of defiance thereunto." N. Eng. 373–4.

This was perfectly proper, doubtless, for the Puritans themselves to

say against all who presumed to differ from *them.* Had the authorities of England so talked to John Cotton and company, the answer would have been, in the classics of Bogue and Bennet, "You impose on conscience, and are only not worse than Satan himself."

NOTE 33, p. 49.

Chalmers describes their sensations graphically. They "thought themselves persecuted, because they were not allowed to persecute." (Annals, p. 135.) They did not mean to show the government any mercy, but when they became the government themselves. Well does Sir R. L'Estrange say, "If toleration might compose the difference, there were some hope; but *that,* alas, is more than they can afford the government." (Holy Cheat, p. 74.—Compare Nalson's Countermine, Ch. 12.)

NOTE 34, p. 51.

Baxter's "Reformed Liturgy,"* is a wondrous curiosity on two accounts, not to mention a dozen others. In disciplining a penitent, the minister may not *absolve* him: that would be hideously popish. So he may "aggravate" the sin, "when it is convenient." (Ref. Lit. p. 64.) And this theory was reduced to practice. For, says Governor Winthrop, of an anti-puritan transgressor, "He made a very free and full confession of his offence, with much *aggravation* against himself, so as the assembly were well satisfied." (Sav. Wint. i. 326.) So then, not to absolve a sin, i. e. to try to make it *less* than it is, but to aggravate it, i. e. to try to make it *worse* than it is, is the way to *improve* upon Jesuitical morality!

Now for a further improvement upon language and doctrine, deemed too popish. The word "Sponsor" is an abomination: so the word "Pro-parent" is adopted. (Ref. Lit. p. 38.) Here again is another instance of getting deeper into trouble, by trying to get out of it. "Pro-parent" is a stronger term than "Sponsor."—Then the Church of England approximates too closely the notion of Transubstantiation. So Baxter would save her by putting the following language into her lips: "This bread and wine, being now set apart and consecrated to this holy use, by God's appointment, are now *no common bread and wine;* but sacramentally the body and blood of Christ." (Ref. Lit. p. 32.) After a baptism, to allude to "Baptismal regeneration," would be heretical. So he gives thanks for an infant's being made "a member of Christ,† by this sacrament of regen-

* This is best known, I believe, as bound up with Calamy's Life of Baxter. It may be found in a more modern work, viz. in Orme's edition of his Practical Works, vol. xv. 449.

† This expression in the Church Catechism, "a member of Christ," horrifies

eration." (Ref. Lit. p. 43.) Let tinkerers on Creeds and Liturgies beware! It would have been a narrow escape for Baxter, at this day, not to have been doomed as a Puseyite.*—See the Reformed Liturgy at the end of the first volume of Calamy's Life of Baxter, for the above quotations.

There was more of what is now called Puseyism among the elder ministers of Puritan descent in New-England, than one in a hundred is aware of; and as the authorities are not of easy access to Episcopalians, I hope I shall be pardoned for taking this opportunity to insert a few.

Governor Winthrop has his child baptized, *within eight days* after its birth. This is a compliance with the letter of the English rubric, now not known.

There was a system of *Church Offerings* in his day, also. Prince's Annals, in vol. vii. Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. pp. 66, 71, for both.

The Puritans are not aware how Popish they are, when they talk of *dedicating*, and never of *consecrating* a Church; as if *to consecrate* were profane. The word *dedicate* is the word the Papists themselves always use. (Broughton's Dict. i. 279.)

When an Episcopalian talks of his Prayer Book, as the best interpretation of the Word of God—when of the first four General Councils—when of Baptismal regeneration—oh, what Popery, cry those, who claim Puritanical affinity. But once it was the orthodox doctrine, that "the truest understanding of these things is from the Platform," i. e. the Platform is the true interpreter of the Bible. See an edition of the Platform, published at Boston, in 1772, p. 67. Then as to the four Councils. In the Preface to the Confession of Faith in 1680, it is said, not that *man* has owned them, but that the *Lord* has done so; and that not faintly, but *signally*. As to Baptismal regeneration, the Platform, ch. xii. sect. 7, tells us, that baptized children, "if not regenerated, yet are in a more hopeful way of attaining regenerating grace, and all the spiritual blessings both of the covenant and seal." This is coming as near to the doctrine, as ninety-nine and three quarters comes to a hundred. For mark! there is a blessing not in the *Covenant* only, but also in its *Seal*.

some, when put upon the lips of a child. Baxter, we see, copies it *literally*, and applies it to an infant.

* If what has been said already would not have settled Baxter's case, as a Puseyite, the following authority must be a finisher:

"I dare not incur the guilt of contradicting two General Councils in a matter of faith, when they anathematize the Dissenters, and agree therein, though disagreeing in other things, and pleading the tradition of the Fathers, and the Scripture." Alas! the tradition of the Fathers to help out Scripture! Oh, luckless Baxter, you are now for ever done for.—See the fatal authority in Orme's Baxter's Practical Works, xv. 530. How could Mr. Orme, as if to make bad worse, put such dismal matter among the *practical* theology of the author of the Saints' Everlasting Rest?

By the way, the acknowledgment of the first four General Councils was no accidental matter. Whitelocke tells us it was done, to show how the Puritans conformed to *proper* English law—that acknowledgment being part of the law of the land. See his Essays, p. 93.

The Puritans began their "Sabbath," as they called it, at sun-down on Saturday. For this they claim most peculiar merit. But, unfortunately, this is an old Romish custom, of which we find traces in England, when Popery was in full blast there, and persecuting the reformer Wicliff. See Gibson's Codex, pp. 280, 282. Or, for a more modern and accessible authority, E. V. Neale, on Feasts and Fasts, pp. 118, 120.*

This keeping of Saturday night, as holy time, is nothing but an imitation of the vigils of the Romish and Oriental churches; and, what is particularly unfortunate in the Puritans, is an imitation of the Romish vigils, which, as Mr. L. Coleman the Congregationalist confesses, were *fasts*, while the Oriental vigils were *festivals*. (Coleman's Antiquities, p. 431.) But this is all natural; for a genuine Puritan is quite in love with many a Romish practice, as we have seen again and again. To finish this particular specification, I must say, that a Puritan uses Romish logic in justifying penalties for the neglect of Puritan holy-days. For example. "As the rulers of Massachusetts colony had authority to command the observance of fasts and thanksgivings, they had like power to enforce the keeping of them." (Coleman's Antiquities, p. 457.) Oh, doubtless. And so, as the Pope and the King of Spain, &c. had authority to command the "Holy and Apostolic Court of the Inquisition" to sit, they had like authority to enforce the keeping of its most orthodox decrees.

As to the use of the Cross *as a symbol*, Thomas Hooker of Hartford, Connecticut, wrote an essay in its behalf, which is among the manuscripts of the Mass. Hist. Society. (See Savage's Winthrop, i. 158, 159, notes. Magnalia, ii. 435, 436.) Will they allow Episcopalians to reprint it? If so, the subscription shall be opened at once.

Episcopalians have sometimes been scouted for saying, that a true ministry and true sacraments, &c., go together. Nevertheless, such was the unequivocal doctrine of the celebrated Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici. Thus, on p. 31, of Part Second, "If our ministry be no true ministry, then is our baptisme no true baptisme, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper no true sacrament, our Church no true Church."

Noah Hobart argued for the Presbyterian *succession*, because there was vastly greater probability it had been preserved unbroken, than the

* For Festivals, &c., too. Neale says, "The dominion of the Long Parliament and of Cromwell was not marked by any alteration in the law concerning holy seasons." Neale, p. 191.

Episcopal. (Second Address to the "Episcopal Separation in N. England," p. 82, etc.)

President Stiles believed in bishops, priests, and deacons, as *jure divino;* only they must never be over more than one congregation. (Stiles' Judges, p. 258.)

President Chauncey believed in weekly communions; and this, Baillie tells us, was *at first* the common practice of the Independents. (Deane's Scituate, p. 89. Baillie's Dissuasive, p. 121.)

Cotton Mather kept sixty fasts and twenty vigils in one year. (Allen's Biog. Dict. p. 568.) The Church of England appoints but sixteen vigils: so this was "positive reformation." Mather's own diary tells us of his fasts!! (Compare Note 70.)

Dr. Hemmenway, in his treatise on the Church, holds this language about the title of church members to grace: "Though the word may come to the heathen, as well as church members, yet it comes not to them by way of covenant, as it doth to church members; nor have they any promise of mercy beforehand, as church members have; nor is it chiefly belonging to such, but unto the children of the covenant." (Hemmenway on the Church, p. 120.) He was quoting an authority older than himself, (his book was published in 1792,) on the church membership of *children.* So all children, out of the Church, are left to *uncovenanted mercies.*

President Clap believed the clergy were the only authorized expounders of Holy Writ. "Ministers, in their public preaching and joint consultation in councils, [councils divine if not infallible,] are an ordinance, *appointed by God,* to hold forth light and truth to his Church, and to declare the true sense and meaning of Scripture." (Discourse on the Doctrines of the N. England Churches, p. 25, New Haven, 1755.) So, according to President Clap, the Church is the interpreter of Scripture.

But again, he abhors the word "sect." "Neither can those who adhere to the *ancient* doctrines of the Christian Church, be properly called a *party.* That odious name properly belongs to each of those particular *sects,* which, from time to time, oppose those doctrines, and thereby make themselves a party." (Discourse, &c., p. 39.)

President Clap was thought, as Allen tells us in his Biographical Dictionary, to be rather too antiquated for his day. Yale College is probably far enough from his latitude now. At any rate, if Dr. Bacon ever sit in President Clap's chair, and will hold forth his doctrine in the Discourse from which I have quoted, I think I can promise him that he shall be endorsed as a very respectable Puseyite, and that he shall receive honorable mention on the pages of "The Churchman" of New York.

I cannot close this note without a word for our Baptist friends, inasmuch as they have employed an editor to vamp anew Neal's Puritans.

What has become of their ancient Puseyism, about *the laying on of hands,* in a quasi confirmation? This was one of their constant practices formerly. (See Benedict's Baptists, i. 218, 480, 487, et alibi. Wall on Inf. Bap. ii. 356.)

Do they ever practice *four ordinations* now, viz., to the orders of deacon, ruling elder, preacher of the Gospel, Evangelist? (Benedict, again, *their own* historian, ii. 176.)

Do they appoint *apostles,* with episcopal if not apostolic powers, as they once did? (Benedict, ii. 54, etc.)

Do they ever practice "*a dry christening*" of infants now? (Benedict, ii. 107.)

Finally, the Romanists have *seven* sacraments, but the Baptists used to have something like *nine,* viz., "Baptism, the Lord's Supper, love-feasts, laying on of hands, washing feet, anointing the sick,* right hand of fellowship, kiss of charity, and devoting children." (Benedict, ii. 107; where also, *elders, elderesses, deaconesses, &c.,* are mentioned.)

Alas, alas, what incorrigible people! Puseyism would not have half satisfied their devouring appetites in those days.

NOTE 35, p. 55.

Here are some testimonies respecting such men as they hesitated not to sacrifice, and the indignities they heaped upon them. "Of the great and good Bishop Hall," says the biographer of the Puritan Dr. Reynolds, "it is only necessary to say, in this place, that there is no instance in the history of the enemies of the Church, of such heartless barbarity, such inconsistent enmity, as they exerted against one of the greatest ornaments of religion and learning which the seventeenth century affords; and all this, because, in the early days of the Revolution, he endeavored to defend his Church by argument, which they were determined to destroy by force." (Reynolds' Works, i. p. lxvi.)

"And in London," says the biographer of Bishop Sanderson, "all the bishops' houses were turned to be prisons, and they filled with divines that would not take the covenant, or forbear reading Common Prayer, or that were accused for some faults like these. For, it may be noted, that about this time the Parliament sent out a proclamation to encourage all laymen that had occasion to complain of their ministers for being troublesome or scandalous, or that conformed not to orders of Parliament, to make their complaint to a select committee for that purpose; and the

* Wall on Inf. Bap. ii. 354.

minister, though one hundred miles from London, was to appear there or be sequestrated; (and you may be sure no parish could want a covetous, or malicious, or cross-grained complainant;) by which means all prisons in London, and in many other places, became the sad habitations of conforming divines." (Bishop Sanderson's Works, new ed. i. 28, 29.)

Clement Walker, a PRESBYTERIAN, speaking of the grievances inflicted by the Committees, says, in his History of Independency, Pt. i. pp. 6, 7, "That to historize them at large, would require a volume as big as the Book of Martyrs; and that the people were then generally of opinion that they might as easily find charity in hell, as justice in any committee, and that the king hath taken down one star-chamber and the parliament have set up a hundred."

See this quoted in Lathbury, pp. 278, 279. See also pp. 196, 197, and quotations from Hallam. Bishop Hall's "Hard Measure," the state ment of an actual sufferer, is in vol. i. of his Works.

Neal tries to smooth over the persecution by the committees thus: "None were turned out or imprisoned for their adhering to the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England, till after the imposing of the Scots Covenant;* but for immorality, false doctrine, non-residence, or for taking part with the king against the parliament."—(Neal, iii. 50.) But Lilly, an impartial *eye-witness*, testifies differently. "In these times, many worthy ministers lost their livings or benefices, for not complying with the *Three-penny Directory*. Had you seen (O noble Esquire) what pitiful idiots were preferred into sequestrated church-benefices, you would have grieved in your soul; but when they came before the classis of divines, could those simpletons but only say they were converted by hearing such a sermon, such a lecture, of that godly man Hugh Peters, Stephen Marshall, or any of that gang, he was presently admitted." (Lilly's Memoirs, new edit. pp. 136, 137.) All this might easily be done, in an age which imprisoned Jeremy Taylor for a frontispiece to his Holy Living and Dying; and tried to deprive the profound Pococke on the ground of ignorance!!—(Lathbury, pp. 188, 280. See also Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy, and Mercurius Rusticus, *passim*.)

If, to all this, we add Cromwell's forbidding the sequestered clergy, after reducing them to beggary, from so much as school-keeping, to save themselves from absolute starvation; and also his project for decimating the already ruined estates of the cavaliers throughout England, it may with truth be said, that the apostate emperor Julian was less cruel to Christians, than Independents, *alias* Puritans, to Churchmen. (See the

* As to the Covenant, no wonder Churchmen were superstitiously afraid of it; for it was found to contain *six* articles and 666 words: "the number of the beast."—Querela Cantabrigiensis, Lond. 1685, p. 205.

notes in Harris's Cromwell, pp. 436–446. Compare the Bulwark Stormed, pp. 86, 87.)—All this is in keeping with Puritan principles; for says a Puritan author, often quoted, "There is no room in Christ's army for toleratorists." (Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Ser. viii. 34.)

NOTE 36, p. 56.

The connexion between Puritans and Papists has often been questioned; and accordingly I subjoin a list of authorities, which may satisfy those who have no means of examining themselves, and enable those who have, to see whether the thing is so rashly maintained, as Puritan writers would fain teach.*

Leslie's Works, folio ii. 94, 560. Or, vol. iv. 190, new edit.—London Cases, iii. 257, etc. 303, etc. with numerous references.—Fowler on Christian Liberty, edit. 1680, p. 207.—Nalson's Countermine, p. 11.—Sherlock on Rel. Assemblies, 3d ed. 1700, p. 224.—Laud's Troubles, folio, p. 587.—Dissenter Disarmed, London, 1681. Pt. i. 141, 142. pt. ii. 41. This book is now very rare, I will therefore so far allude to the last reference as to say, it mentions familiarly together the names of Jesuits and Puritans, to show how they were associated in the minds of the people. It calls the first "Puritan-Papist," and the last "Puritan-Protestant." And it is remarkable that Bishop Montague, so strongly suspected of popery himself, should have called the Jesuits "Puritan-Papists," long before. See his Appeal, pp. 112, 113. "Our revolters unto popery," said he, "were Puritans, avowed or addicted, first." No wonder they tried to ward off his keen truth, by calling *him* a Papist.

Calamy's Baxter, i. 100, 101, 102, 103.—Baxter, in his dislike of some things in the Independents, tries to make out how the Papists deluded and used them. "The friars and Jesuits were their deceivers, and, under several vizors, were dispersed among them."† So here is Richard Baxter admitting that the Puritans and Jesuits were intermingled!! This accords fully with the records of old Strype, whom I would quote if I could, but the note would be too long. See Strype's Annals, folio, of 1709. For the year 1560, chap. ix. pp. 220, 221. Also for 1568, chap. lii. pp. 521, 522.

* Compare Orme's Baxter's Works, i. 642; where, besides Baxter's testimony, may be found Archbishop Usher's, and Archbishop Bramhall's.

† There is a curious coincidence between Popery and Puritanism, which I believe few know, i. e. their multiplying the Notes of the Church beyond those given in the ancient Creeds. The Creeds say that the Church is one, holy, catholic, apostolic, i. e. has *four* notes or marks. But Popery by Bellarmine says she has *fifteen*, and Congregationalism by Bartlet that she has *seven*. Both indulge private judgment, on such a subject.—See Bellarmine's Notes, ed. 1840.—Bartlet's Congregational Way. 647, p 139.

Collier's Ecc. Hist. ii. 518; or, vi. 463.—Dugdale's Short View, &c. p. 16, &c.—Maddox's Vindication, pp. 6, 183, 184.—Lavington's Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared, part. ii. p. 179, &c. ed. 1749.—Carwithen's Ch. of Eng. ii. 94, with references in a note.—Th. Fuller's Thoughts, p. 269: Papists: he says, "multiply as maggots in May, and act in and under the fanatics."—Saywell against Baxter, p. 329.—Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation. The Preface.—South's Sermons, ii. 40.—Barwick on the Church, pp. xix, xx.—Jones of Nayland's Theological Works, v. 60.—Wall on Baptism, Oxf. ed. 1835, ii. 371, etc.—Puller's Moderation, chap. xvii. sect. 7, or, p. 291, &c. new edit.—Stephens' Life of Archbp. Sharp, pp. 258, 554.—Lathbury's Eng. Epis. p. 45, &c.—British Critic, xv. 67.—Perceval's Apost. Succ. ch. vi. obj. 3.—Finally, the Puritans believed in *extreme unction.* See Th. Goodwin's Works, vol. iv. Treatise on Ch. Gov't. p. 387, etc.* What has become of this ancient, more than Puseyite practice? did the Presbyterians laugh them out of it? Mr. Edwards speaks very scornfully of it, in the preface to his Gangraena: to say nothing of his efforts, Pt. i. p. 40, to show the strong likeness between all the sectaries of his day, (among whom, p. 12, he puts the Puritan-Independents,) and the worst of Rome's orders—the Jesuits.

Upon this entire "squadron of authorities," as Master Prynne would say, I will make but one remark; and that relates to p. 6, of Bishop Maddox. He there shows, that the Puritans copy the Jesuits in their "ceremonial accoutrements." The Puritans wished to avoid the *surplice*, which resembles the dress of a Romish parish-priest, and therefore they adopted a *black gown*, which resembles the dress of the Jesuits. So the black gown of Geneva is an *outward* imitation of Jesuitry!! I may well ask, under the Presbyterian auspices of Mr. Edwards, is that the only way in which its adherents have copied it?†

NOTE 37, p. 56.

I presume, by a little research among modern publications, it would be easy to pick up many a sad forewarning by Churchmen, of the consequences of a union of Romanists and Dissenters. I have not the means at hand to enable me to give references. One or two, perhaps, may suffice for a hundred. Mr. Southey speaks strongly upon the subject, on p. xvi. Pref. to his Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Also, p. 518, in the body of his book.

* Compare Edwards' Antapologia, pp. 36, 262.—Wall on Inf. Bap. ii. 354.

† The Edinburgh Review, in spite of its whiggery, answers this question against the Puritans; for it candidly says, "in spite of their hatred of Popery, they too often fell into the worst vices of that bad system." Selections Edinb. Rev. ii. 60.

NOTE 38, p. 57.

This mode of argument (the calling of hard names) was one afterwards paid back upon themselves, even in New England. Mrs. Hutchinson and her followers called the Puritan ministers "Baal's priests, Popish factors," &c. &c. &c. (See Upham's Vane, p. 133, etc.) Whitfield and his followers dealt in the same commodity, even more liberally. Dr. Chauncey has collected a tremendous catalogue, on pp. 249, 250, of his "Seasonable Thoughts," published in 1743. Whitfield must have been tart and bitter; but sometimes, I suspect, he found his match. "In a company of gentlemen, where Father Flynt, who was a preacher and many years a tutor at Cambridge, was present, Mr. Whitfield said, 'It is my opinion that Dr. Tillotson is now in hell for his heresy.' Father Flynt replied, 'It is my opinion you will not meet him there.'" (Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. iii. 211.)

Doubtless it will be said, that Churchmen were as violent against the Puritans, as the Puritans against them. But I may confidently appeal to Sir Matthew Hale, as a most impartial witness upon this subject. In his "True Religion," published by Richard Baxter (!), he bears the following remarkable testimony: "I do remember when Ben Johnson made his play of the Alchymist, wherein he brings in Ananias, in derision of the persons then called Puritans, with many of their phrases in use among them, taken out of the Scriptures, with a design to render that sort of persons ridiculous, and to gain applause to his wit and fancy. But although those persons were not in very good esteem among the great ones and gallants, yet the play was disliked, and indeed abhorred; because it seemed to reproach religion itself, though intended only to render the Puritans ridiculous." (Edit. 1684, p. 44.) Now, surely, those who visited a play-house would not be so sensitive as the soberer part of an Episcopal community; and yet, Judge Hale and Richard Baxter being witnesses, even they were not disposed to ridicule the *religion* of the Puritans. But it was the *religion* of Churchmen, principally, on which Puritans poured out their bitterest vituperations.

NOTE 39, p. 57.

Bishop Meade of Virginia will surely be admitted as unexceptionable testimony, to the conduct and character of the English bishops, though he do wear the lawn himself. No Presbyterian or Puritan doubts *his* evangelical character. Yet he says as follows, in his Address to his Convention in 1844. "As to the Church of England, it is a well known fact, that not only were bishops chief martyrs of the Reformation, but when, at any time, there was evinced a disposition to return again to Romish

doctrines and practices, the bishops were, for the most part, the decided opponents of it. The history of the Church of England will show, that they were generally for *moderate measures*, not so much towards Rome, as towards those who had separated from the English Church, being anxious not for union with Rome, but for comprehension of those who protested against Rome; and could their wise and conciliatory councils have prevailed, on more than one occasion the breaches might have been in some good degree repaired." Again, he blames the unreasonableness of the Puritans. "In England, when the Puritans objected to some few of them, [expressions in the Liturgy,] there were those among the bishops and clergy who were willing to have omitted, or modified them; believing that naught of the true doctrine of the Reformers or of the Bible would be lost thereby, and but for the *unreasonableness* of the opposite party it would have been done.' (Bishop Meade's Address, 1844, pp. 5, 9.)

With this compare Milton's portraiture of the English Bishops.—"But they, contrary, that by the impairing and diminution of the true faith, the distresses and servitude of their country, aspire to high dignity, rule and promotion here, after a shameful end in this life, (which God grant them,*) shall be thrown down eternally into the darkest and deepest gulf of hell, where, under the despiteful control, the trample and spurn of all the other damned, that, in the anguish of their torture, shall have no other ease than to exercise a raving and bestial tyranny over them as slaves and *negroes*, they shall remain in that plight forever, the basest, the lowermost, the most dejected, most underfoot, and down-trodden vassals of perdition." See his "Reformation in England," at the end. (Prose Works, p. 21. Lond. ed. 1838.)

But how could the heads of the Church expect more mercy, when even the humble tenants of its orchestras were thus berated by Prynne;—"Choristers bellow the tenor, as it were oxen; bark a counterpart, as it were a kennel of dogs; roar out a treble, as it were a sort of bulls; and grunt out a bass, as it were a number of hogs." Prynne could not say that they *sung* Romanism, if he could that Archbishop Laud *wrote* it; and yet to make the Church ridiculous, he spared not even them.—(Hone's Year Book, p. 66. Granger's Biog. Dict. 2d ed. i. 205.)

NOTE 40, p. 59.

Their opinions of the Canons I have not given. They may be formed from the title of a book published in 1640. "England's complaint to Jesus Christ, against the Bishops' canons of the late sinful synod, a sedi-

* The *curses* of Popery, as the Quakers well know, were never objected to by the Puritans.

tious conventicle, a pack of hypocrites, a sworn confederacy, a traitorous conspiracy against the true religion of Christ, and the weal of the public of the land, and consequently against the kingdom and crown." Locke's Works, x. 244, note.

It may be supposed that when the Puritans got scot free from Ap. Laud, they left such language behind them. Not so.* They took what Cotton Mather calls "the revenges of a deep repentance," on this side of the Atlantic. Dr. Chauncey thus rails at the Liturgy, &c., *forty years* after he had abandoned them, and when he came to die! Among his chief sins to be mourned for at that awful hour, he especially desired to remember his "many sinful compliances with, and conformity unto, vile human inventions, and will-worship, and hell-bred superstition, and patcheries stitcht into the service of the Lord: which the English Mass Book, I mean the Book of Common Prayer and the ordination of priests, &c., are fully fraught withal." And with such language, recorded in his last will and testament, he supposed himself going to that blessed place, where the greatest of the virtues—one that leaves repentance, faith, and hope, all, all behind it—is charity! (Mather's Magnalia, i. 421.)

NOTE 41, p. 60.

As a specimen of what they would substitute for the Litany, I give an extract from a mock Litany, quoted by Harris.

"From this prelatical pride and their lordly dignities,
From all their superstitious vanities and Popish ceremonies,
From their most corrupt courts and their vexing slaveries,
From their fruitless shadows and hypocritical formalities,
From their hatred and malice against Christ's appointed ordinances,
From their sinful synods and all their papal hierarchy,
From Abaddon and Apollyon, with their priests, jesuits,
their favorites and all their furious blasphemers,
Good Lord deliver us!"

(Harris's Cromwell, p. 49.) Who but a furious blasphemer could indite such a Litany as this?

NOTE 42, p. 60.

The Puritans appropriated *all* Scripture to themselves, in the most wholesale way. There was a book of metre Psalms set forth by Parliament in 1644. Psalm 94, verse 7, reads thus:

* The same language almost is used in England, to this day. See the tracts of "The Rev. William Thorn, Winchester." Here are the titles of two: "All Church People essentially Papists"—"The Church more opposed to Dissent than to Immorality," &c, &c. This is a *winning* way to convert Churchmen!

The Lord yet shall not see, they say,
Nor Jacob's God shall note.

In the margin there is a note to explain to the reader, that by "Jacob's God" is meant "the God of the Puritans." [Lathbury, p. 311, note.) It is curious, but not very surprising, to find the Mohammedans appropriating the Psalms in the same way. (Ockley's Saracens, p. 192.)

NOTE 43, p. 63.

The Christian Observer's opinion has been quoted, because many are governed by the opinion of volumes which they are familiar with, and accustomed to respect. Really, however, it is by no means so strong in expression, or in fact, as the following from an "old school" Presbyterian, who lived in the days of the Puritans, and saw their excesses with his own eyes. "And we find it by experience in England, how, since the Reformation began in the first and second years of the Parliament, wherein we thought the devil had and should have been cast out of England, what fresh footing he hath got again. And I am confident that, for the present, the devil hath gained more in the matter of false doctrine, disorder, deformation, anarchy, and libertinism, than he lost in the Reformation, by putting down of many Popish errors, superstitious practices and tyrannies. Yea, I think it may be said safely, that the devil hath had a more plentiful harvest this last year in England, than ever in any one year since the Reformation. Nay, certainly more damnable doctrines, heresies, and blasphemies, have been of late vented among us than in *fourscore years before.*"* And again. "The points complained of in Dr. Jackson, Bishop Montague, &c., were harmlesse, wholesome errors, (if any errors could be harmlesse and wholesome,) in comparison of many errors in this catalogue. [Jackson, Montague, &c., were the Puseyites, be it remembered, of those days.] Certainly if Mahomet were

* Compare Dr. Owen himself. "If vain spending of time, talents, unprofitableness in men's places, envy, strife, variance, emulations, wrath, pride, worldliness, selfishness, be badges of Christians, we have them on us and among us, in abundance."—"Oh what a picture of Puritanism by a Puritan's very self!—See Owen's Mortification of Sin in Believers, p. 29.—And again, more plainly still, in another of his treatises: "He that should see the prevailing part of these nations, many of those in rule, power, favor, with all their adherents, and remember that they were a colony of Puritans, whose habitation was in a low place, as the prophet speaks of the city of God, translated by an high hand to the mountains they now possess, cannot but wonder how soon they have forgot the customes, manners, ways of their own old people, and are cast into the mould of them that went before them in the places whereunto they are translated. * * *What were those before us that we are not? what did they which we do not?*" Owen's Book of Temptations, pp. 55, 56.—Compare Nelson's Life of Bull, ed. 1827, p. 44.—Hey's Lectures, Book. iv. Art. xi. Sec. 12.

now alive among us, he would be a gallant fellow in these times, and be in great request for his revelations and New Light. Yea, we are fain to that madnesse and folly, that I am persuaded, if the devil came visibly among many, and held out INDEPENDENCY, and liberty of conscience, and should preach never such false doctrines ; as that there were no devils, no hell, no sin at all, but these were only men's imaginations, with several other doctrines, he would be cried up, followed, admired. And if it should happen he were complained of and questioned by some PRESBYTERIANS, (for to be sure sectaries would not,) he would have some or other to speak for him, and help to bring him off." (Edwards' Gangraena, Pt. ii. pp. 67, 68, 75. Third edit. London, 1646)

Does any one now say *my* comments on Puritanism are severe ? I defy the production from my pages, of any thing comparable to the severity of this Presbyterian, who saw it, and described it, with its image in *living array* before him ! This acknowledgment of Edwards is of immense value as testimony ; and as to the confusion, heresy, &c., of Puritan times, Dr. Reynolds himself uses language scarcely less emphatic. See his Sermon before Parliament, previous to the Restoration, but when Cromwell was dead, and he was not afraid to speak out ! Life in his Works, i. pp. lvii., lviii. See also the very strong language of the London ministers in 1647, in their testimony to the " Solemn League and Covenant"—Quoted in Stephens' Life of Ap. Sharp, pp. 554, 555. This testimony confessed that instead of a *reformation*, they had a *deformation* of religion.—See also Chauncey's " Seasonable Thoughts," pp. 351, 352.

NOTE 44, p. 63.

Compare such instances as honest old Howell, a layman too, gives in his Familiar Letters ; and of which he says he " could produce a cloud of examples." (Book iv. Lett. 43, or p. 506.) People wonder at the strength of *our* expressions respecting the Puritans. Howell saw them with his own eyes, and this is his record. " Difference in opinion may work a *disaffection* in me, but not a *detestation*. I rather pity than hate *Turk*, or *Infidel ;* for they are of the same metal, and bear the same stamp as I do, though the inscriptions differ. If I hate any, 'tis those schismatics that puzzle the sweet peace of our Church ; so that I could be content to see an *Anabaptist* go to hell on a *Brownist's* back." (Book i. Section vi. Lett. 32.) Now the Puritans thought the Anabaptists the most horrible of all sectaries in their day. Yet here is an impartial observer, who gives them the preference to the Puritanical Brownists.

NOTE 45, p. 63.

Grant's Eng. Ch., i. 456. Also, Maskell's Martin MarPrelate, p. 197.* Possibly it may amuse some of my readers to see part of the epitaph, which church-wits of the day wrote for the traitors alluded to by Mr. Grant.

Hic jacet, ut pinus,
Nec Cæsar, nec Ninus,
Nec Petrus, nec Linus,
Nec Magnus Godwinus,
Nec plus, nec minus,
Quam clandestinus,
Miser ille Martinus,
Videte Singuli.

O vos Martinistæ,
Et vos Brownistæ,
Et vos Barrowistæ,
Et vos Atheistæ,
Et Anabaptistæ,
Et vos Hacketistæ,
Et Wiggintonistæ,
Et omnes Sectistæ,
Quorum dux fuit iste,
Lugete Singuli.

NOTE 46, p. 64.

The kindness of the English Government to Protestant refugees from the Continent, is ascribed by Neal to Archbp. Grindal; so reluctant is he that Queen Elizabeth should have a jot of praise for it. (Neal i. 395, note.) De Laune even abuses the government for criminal partiality, on account of it. "Is it not," he says, "a wonderful contradiction to abet, succor, and relieve the French Presbyterian Dissenters, under their cruel persecution for their non-conformity, and yet, at the same time, to exercise all that cruelty, ruin, and destruction to the English Presbyterian non-conformist: like the Scribes and Pharisees, who built the tombs of the prophets, and at the same time killed the prophets?" (*De Laune's Plea, &c.* p. 102.†) Not at all, Mr. De Laune; for you yourself admit, on p. 96, that "If some of the non-conformists are found tardy, on good proof, let them suffer the penalty of the law." Now multitudes of them were tardy enough to be contented and quiet; and the government had to try its ferule, as a schoolmaster on refractory pupils. Besides, your complaint shows, incontestably, what we Churchmen want to show, that the government did make a distinction, and a great distinction. It, just as you say, abetted, succored, and relieved the peaceable and submissive: those who would tolerate England, if England would tolerate them.

* The reading by Maskell varies a little from the one given. Doubtless there were many versions of it.

† My edition is the Boston one of 1763. This was the era of the Mayhew and Althorp controversy, of which I must speak by and by; and it was no doubt put forth then, to heighten, if possible, bad impressions against Episcopacy. De Laune had suffered for his Plea, eighty years previously.

This book of De Laune's, by the way, is one of the Puritan masterpieces.* Doubtless many have heard of it, who never heard how effectually it was answered by E. Hart and Dr. Brett, in the "Bulwark Stormed." My copy bears date London, 1717. The Puritans (and their coadjutors the Baptists, when Episcopacy is to be annihilated) are sadly ignorant of the answers made to their philippics; for an Episcopal book, to many of them, has poison in its very cover. For example, to my perfect amazement, I once heard a Baptist, afterwards a president of a college, speak of Campbell's Lectures on Ecc. History, as a book Churchmen had never so much as pretended to answer. When I named Skinner's Truth and Order to him, he stared like a man electrified.

NOTE 47, p. 65.

"The Queen's preference for Churchmen," says one who favors the Puritans as much as he can, "was inevitable. She disfavored the Puritans, not only for disputing her authority, but as in her judgment distracting the Protestant party. The season for open war against the Catholics was fast approaching." (Mackintosh's Eng. in one vol. p. 374, Chap xviii.) This shows, clearly, that the Queen did not oppose the Puritans from that love of Popery, which has been slanderously imputed to her. They criminally, not to say foolishly, weakened their own side, and hers too; while Popery rejoiced in the distractions of Protestants, and hoped to crush them all indiscriminately. No wonder she was vexed: any good Protestant ought to have been. Sir James's testimony is very important, and should be well remembered. Puller's defence of the Government from the charge of persecution, raised on *this* side by Romanists, and on *that* by Separatists, is well worth examination. (Moderation, Ch. xiii. §. 8, or p. 235, new edit.)

NOTE 48, p. 65.

This pretence of Mr. Neal's looks very suspicious. Puritans were not apt to deal in fool's play. Their native language looks much more like Gov. Winthrop's postscript to that most unfortunate victim of long-armed vengeance, who was dragged from Rhode Island to Boston—I mean Samuel Gorton. "You must know, withal," says the Governor, "that the Court did not intend their order should be a scare-crow, (as

* De Laune annexes to his Plea his trial, fine, &c. De Laune was tried in 1683. Checkley was tried and fined, as a libeller, in 1724, more than forty years after, for publishing Leslie on Episcopacy. And still, in the very place of Checkley's trial, [Boston] they proclaim De Laune's story in 1763. They had contrived to forget poor Checkley.

you write ;) for you will find it real and effectual, if you transgress it." (R. I. Hist. Coll. ii. 152.) This sounds like Puritan vernacular; and completely sets at naught Neal's poetical version of *in terrorem.*

NOTE 49, p. 69.

Mr. Leonard Bacon, in his Address before the New England Society, Dec. 22, 1838, is completely gravelled by the Restoration. He blames the Puritans for it excessively ; and calls the people who allowed it, infatuated. Meanwhile, let us take all the comfort we can, from his wry-faced concessions. He admits that it was the faults of the Puritans themselves, which occasioned the Restoration ; and that it was the PEOPLE who got tired of them, and preferred to be emancipated from *their* yoke, rather than from the thraldom of Episcopacy. But let us hear him. "By their errors and faults, the great cause, which their virtue so earnestly espoused, and their valor so strongly defended, was wrecked and almost ruined. But dearly did they pay, in disappointment, in persecution, in many sufferings, in the contempt which was heaped upon them by the infatuated people they had vainly struggled to emancipate—the penalty of their faults and errors." (Address, p. 29.) Charles I. was beheaded Jan. 30, 1648 ; and Charles II. was restored May 29, 1660. So the *sovereign* empire of Puritanism was about twelve years long.* And now, query : Could that cause be so exceedingly virtuous and valorous, whose own faults and errors wrecked and ruined it before it got into its *teens;* and could they be a very infatuated people, who found out so soon how hollow were its promises of blessed emancipation ?

NOTE 50, p. 71.

Well might he, for two things, to say no more. When Nicholas Upshal (himself a Puritan) ventured to expostulate with Endicott, he had him fined, imprisoned, and banished ; and though he was weakly and old, and it was *winter,* he said, '*I'll not bate him one groat.*' Poor Upshal was kindly received and entertained by an Indian ; who made this striking remark, 'What a God have the English, who deal so with one another about their God!' (Sewel's Quakers, 161.) To Wenlock Christison, who was sentenced to be hung, but spared because they were afraid of an "*in terrorem*" mandamus of Charles II., which soon after arrived, Endicott said in open court, '*Unless you will renounce your religion, you shall surely die.*' (Sewel, 278.) Where are the passages in Laud's life to surpass these ?

* The Long Parliament met, Nov. 3, 1640, and was forcibly dissolved by Cromwell, April, 20, 1653. I think twelve years a fair estimate, for the *sovereignty* of Puritanism over Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, &c.

NOTE 51, p. 72.

To the complaints and attacks of the Puritans, Abp. Abbot's reply was, "Yield, and they will be pleased at last:" Abp. Laud's, "Resolve, for there is no end of yielding." (Le Bas's Laud, p. 170.) And now, as to which policy was the more correct, let the following testimony speak: "That the *spirit of contentiousness* did enter largely into the dispute, is manifest from the whole of its subsequent history. The Puritans could plead loudly for *toleration*, when they were comparatively weak; but after they had gained strength, they denounced all *toleration*, as nothing but an artifice used to preserve and protect the fragments of the Babylonish superstition." (Le Bas's Jewel, p. 170.) John Cotton's conduct in Old England and New England is a striking confirmation of this remark. (See Eliot's Biog. Dict. p. 136.)

NOTE 52, p. 72.

This is the man, who, when a hapless Quaker was beaten, till "his body turned cold," and "there seemed, as it were, a struggle between life and death," could gloat over the sight, and say, "W. Brend endeavored to beat our Gospel Ordinances black and blue; if he then be beaten black and blue, it is but just upon him, and I will appear upon his behalf that did so." He said this when the good feelings of some revolted at the awful scourging, and would have had the executioner himself punished. Norton interposed, and became his advocate! Well does Sewel add, "It is therefore not much to be wondered at, that these precise and bigoted rulers, who would be looked upon to be eminent for piety, were so cruel in persecuting; since their Chief Teacher thus wickedly encouraged them to it." (Sewel, 195, 196.)

As to the sentiment here advanced by Norton, there is no doubt of the industry with which he and a multitude of others have endeavored to spread and perpetuate the idea, that religion, and religion only, was concerned in the settlement of New England. But the very attempt to ward off the imputation, that "trade" was concerned in it, shows where the shoe pinched. And we find, now and then, one more accurate, or more candid than the rest, making admissions which subtract not a little from such broad assertions as Norton's. Dudley's involuntary exposure we have seen; and also Mr. Young's narrowing the title of Pilgrim to the settlers at Plymouth. Cotton Mather has done a similar thing. In an effort to decry the settlers east of Boston, he tells a tale which shows that there were some more honest *out of* Puritan pulpits, than *in* them. "There have been some fine settlements in the north-east regions, but what has become of them? I have heard that one of our ministers,

once preaching to a congregation there, urged them to approve themselves a religious people from this consideration, that otherwise they would contradict the main end of planting this wilderness. Whereupon a well-known person, then in the assembly, cried out, 'Sir, you are mistaken, you think you are preaching to the people at the Bay: our main end was to catch fish.'" (Magnalia, i. 62.)* I would not repeat it, but that experience teaches me its necessity; it must never be forgotten, that the main end by the Charter was to convert the Indians! It would seem as if the English government had learned something of Puritan rhetoric and logic, for in the Connecticut Charter, (a striking change and addition,) that conversion is said to be the principal and *only* end! Jesuitical perversions required the utmost precision. (See Acts and Laws of Connecticut, The Charter, p. 6, New London, 1769.)

NOTE 53, p. 77.

How different the principle with which Episcopal Virginia commenced her career, viz. "universal suffrage and equality." (Burk's Virginia, i. 302.) Mr. Bancroft is candid enough to mention this, in the *first* edition of his United States, (vol. i. 390;) but his memory failed him, (profound democrat though he be,) when he reached the *seventh*—perhaps sooner, but I have no intermediate edition. (See vol. i. 360, seventh edit.) Admirable indeed! And this is the man who, in one breath, can boast of his own extensive researches: and then, with another, blast a whole batch of his fellow-historians as "not trustworthy!" (Bancroft's U. States, i. 300, note.) I dare not say, with Milton, about the bishops, God grant such historians a shameful end; but I will say, May he teach them better to unlearn their want of charity.

The fact mentioned in this note should be carefully remembered, when the praises of the Puritans are chanted as the founders of civil liberty. The Puritans of Massachusetts began with a narrower principle than that of England, in her most Laudean days! Belknap is candid enough to mention this; and, unlike *other* historians, sticks to his text. "They had already proceeded," he says, "a step farther than the hierarchy had ever attempted." (Farmer's Belknap, i. 43.) But Churchmen began with "universal suffrage and equality." Well may Mr. Burk say, of the noble State whose history he has undertaken, "Whilst all the great nations of Europe were sunk in slavery, and England herself was engaged in an incessant struggle with her monarch, in defence of a few undefined

* This subject of fish-catching was not forgotten by the ministers in Massachusetts; for there we find Hugh Peters, *e. g.* making a circuit, "to excite a spirit of enterprise in the fishery." Felt's Salem, p. 94.

and scanty privileges, Virginia, separated as it were from the whole world, heard the voice of liberty like sweet music vibrate in her wilds." (Burk's Va. i. 303, 304.)

I must add, that there is another sad self-mutilation committed by Mr. Bancroft, in the same paragraph where we have now detected his pruning-hook, which must be noticed hereafter.

NOTE 54, p. 78.

Mr. Bancroft admits Laud's honesty, (United States, i. 454;) and says, on page 407, that "It is not strange," he and his associates should have esteemed "the inhabitants of Massachusetts" men "of refractory humors," who consented in nothing "but hostility to the Church of England;" and also in "designs to shake off the royal jurisdiction." Indeed! and was it less strange, then, that they should think they were surrounded by similar individuals, at home? Was it at all strange, that they should think Puritanism just as refractory and conspiring in Old England as in New? Mr. Bancroft of course deems Laud a bigot: it is a great stride in him, however, towards candor, to catch a glimpse of his honesty. For even so much as that I give him no "faint praise;" and I respectfully beg Episcopalians to see just as much of honesty in Boston, as he sees in Lambeth.

NOTE 55, p. 78.

The ingenuity of Ap. Laud's tormentors almost surpasses conception. A proposition was actually introduced into the House of Commons, May 1, 1643, that he should be transported to New England, *unheard* and *untried*, and left to be fretted to death by sectaries; who would gladly have seen him tortured out of existence by the slowest, if surest, of contrivable miseries. True, this "monstrous proposal" was concocted by Hugh Peters, whom Oldmixon, his friend, admits "would be whimsical," (Brit. America, i. 85,)* and who might have been thinking of the proverb, *Felis in Tartaro sine unguibus.* But it shows the spirit of the times, that the project could be entertained and debated. (Le Bas's Laud, p. 300.)

And it shows the spirit of Puritan historians, that Mr. Felt can describe Peters's effort as an act of mercy to the poor harassed archbishop. (Felt's Salem, p. 136.) Mercy? I would commend to Mr. Felt the language of Edmund Burke: "I vow to God, I would sooner bring myself to put a man to immediate death for opinions I disliked, and so to get rid

* One of his nine gifts was "convenient boldness." Phenix Britannicus, p. 257.

of the man and his opinions at once, than to fret him with a feverish being, tainted with the jail-distemper of contagious servitude." (Burke's Wks. Boston, 1839, ii. 258.) Moreover, as a testimony of his affection for Laud's person, Parliament, after his execution, granted his library to Peters! This library, Mr. Felt says, Peters *designed* to send, where he had intended to send its owner. But some how or other it never got over here. Still this is a sweet proof of his affection for New England!

After such exhibitions, in such historians as Bancroft and Felt, it ill becomes Puritans to complain that a Churchman's spectacles will not allow him to see clearly through all the turns and twists of Puritan annals.

While upon a fact in Laud's life, I hope to be excused for alluding to two or three more; so industriously and systematically has his ill-starred name been a subject for Puritan calumniation.

In Eliot's Dict. p. 293, and in the Mass. Hist. Coll, 2d ser. i. 167, he is traduced for excessive cruelty to a Mr. Lathrop, a Puritan minister. Whereas, even Secretary Morton admits that Laud treated him with wonderful consideration; and that it was *he*, and not the king, as Eliot and the Mass. Hist. Coll. say, who granted him liberty. (Davis's Morton, pp. 257, 258.)

Laud is universally denounced as a secret Papist by Puritan writers. Yet the Protesant Rapin acknowledges, there is not "the least probability" that either the king or the archbishop ever formed the design of restoring the Romish religion. (Rapin's Hist. Tindal's Edit. ii. 290; or viii. 526, 527.* Compare Masere's Tracts, pp. 146, 515.) Rapin was a Protestant of Huguenot descent; and such Protestants have never had those bitter prejudices against Episcopacy, &c, which have been the *monomania* of the Puritans. See Bingham's Apology of the French Church, in vol. ix. of his Works.†

Laud is universally denounced, too, as one of the lowest of Arminians, and a hater of all Calvinists. Nevertheless, says Anthony Wood, Bishop Barnabas Potter, "though a thorough-paced Calvinist, was made Bishop of Carlisle by the endeavors of Bishop Laud." (Oxonienses, ii. 12, edit.

* The note Rapin gives from the Complete History of England is another valuable authority. "Laud would never bring his neck under the obedience of the Roman yoke, though he might stick for the grandeur of the clergy."—This testimony is from any hand but a partial one.

† Even Berington, the zealous Papist who writes Panzani's Memoirs, admits that Laud was no Papist; and what is better, explains *why* and *how*, he was thought to be one. The cause of all the clamor against Laud, he says, was his opposition to Puritanism. This is *exact truth*, say it who may.—Panzani's Memoirs, p. 139, note.

1721. Baker's Chronicle, p. 463, edit. 1670.) And Wood, the Hon. Mr. Savage calls "honest," even when he undertakes to correct a mistake in him. Not, be it understood of my present fact, but of what all may mistake about—a matter of pedigree. (Sav. Wint. ii. 240, note 3.)*

To show still further the friendly terms on which Laud was with Calvinists, less hot-headed and revolutionary than the Puritans, I refer to the Presbyterian Mr. Baillie. In vol. i. 189–194 of his Letters and Journals, edit. 1775, there is given a correspondence of the most free and respectful kind, between Laud on the one hand, and the Calvinists of Zurich, &c., on the other, about the troubles in England, in 1639. They sign themselves his "most respective servants;" and he begins his reply thus, "My most beloved FELLOW-BRETHREN, and most learned PASTORS and Professors, of the CHURCHES and Universities of Zurich, Bern," &c.

And now, really, after giving this, and noting some ominous words in small capitals, instead of being afraid that Laud will be accounted a High-Churchman and an Arminian, my only fear is that some will call him a Low-Churchman and a secret Calvinist!!

NOTE 56, p. 78.

This great book of Laud's is not at all known, out of the Church, and not as well known there, as it should be. It is unfortunately too much like himself, who always cared more for facts than appearances. If its rhetoric and arrangement were more inviting, it would be as popular as it is thorough. Take it, however, as we find it, and when any of his calumniators can produce a book half as full of able matter against Popery, they may call him Papist with some small plausibility, if they can. It is an easy thing to decry Robin Hood, without being able to shoot in his bow. It is easy to call a man a Papist, who has done Popery more mischief than his defamers can do in a century.

To show how the Archbishop's book was esteemed by both friend and foe, in his own times, I give the following references. "And so long as that incomparable piece of his against Fisher continues in the world, it will be an eternal monument of his learning, piety, and firmness in the Protestant doctrine." (Nalson's Countermine, 210, 4th edit. London. 1684. Brit. Critic, xv. 73.) Sir Edward Dering, who could say very hard things of Laud in Parliament, yet bears this unequivocal and noble testimony to his controversial volume: "His book lately set forth, especially for the latter half thereof, hath muzzled the Jesuit, and shall strike

* To show further Laud's disfavor towards Arminians, he opposed the admission of Grotius into England. Charles Butler's Life of Grotius, p. 135.

the Papist under the fifth rib, when he is dead and gone." (Harris's Charles I., 207. Compare Rushworth's Coll. iii., p. 1326. Hallam's Introd. to Lit. iii. 30, 31. Wellwood's Memoirs, p. 61, ed. 1700.) And still the man, who, being dead, yet speaketh against Popery more emphatically than a myriad of his enemies, was a Papist himself! (Compare Laud's Troubles, p. 616.)

> O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts,
> And men have lost their reason!

NOTE 57, p. 79.

Mr. Francis quotes with vast complacency the infidel Hume, to prove that the Puritans were the virtual authors of "the whole freedom" of the English constitution. (Hume, v. 134.) How he can reconcile such proof of their authorship, of all the freedom of England, with the proof, from the same authority, that they intended this freedom for *themselves alone*, and openly taught (Hume, v. 172) that "no others ought to be tolerated," I know not. Perhaps this is one of the mysteries of consistency, in which Mr. F. is able to believe; while he vehemently rejects those of the infinite Godhead.

The claim set up by Mr. Francis, on the authority of Hume, is reiterated with high satisfaction by Dr. Hawes, (Tribute, p. 57, 2d ed.,) and by similar writers. But the other side must be heard, as well as they. Against Mr. F. and Dr. H., I can easily set off such writers as Miller and Lathbury. "Though," says the first, "as will hereafter be shown, the struggles occasioned by the efforts of the Puritans did essentially contribute to the development of the principles of freedom, it is by no means true, as the historian [Hume] has stated, that the English owe to this sect the whole freedom of their government." (Miller's Phil. of Hist. iii. 327.) This is from one who is disposed to take the most favorable view of their case. Mr. Lathbury is vastly less complaisant; but he indulges in no random allegations. His appeal is to stubborn facts.—"The revolution, however, was effected by Churchmen, and Churchmen were the framers of the Act of Toleration. The assertion that the tree of religious liberty was planted and watered by the Puritans, is entirely destitute of foundation. Had they advocated toleration, the assertion would have been correct. They did not contend for liberty to all, but for the establishment of their own discipline." (Lathbury's Eng. Episcopacy, p. 62.)

NOTE 58, p. 79.

The precincts of the Massachusetts Charter were vastly narrower than multitudes suppose. Massachusetts Bay, according to the Charter,

was what is now called Boston Bay; for the Charles River is described as being in the bottom of it. Now, the chartered territory lay between three miles north of the Merrimack, and three miles south of Boston Bay, and the course of the Charles River. As to the bearing of the Charter upon the interior, between these points, it is difficult to determine it; since the boundary there was an imagined "south sea," surrounding New England, and making it an Island*—hence the name after the Island across the ocean. Practically, the Charter gave Massachusetts jurisdiction over what is now called Essex county and Middlesex county. Yet the Governor, &c., easily made their power stretch so as to reach Rhode Island! The Plymouth colony might have claimed the northern part of Rhode Island, with vastly better grace; but Massachusetts was notorious for what an early settler called its "engrasping" propensities. It swallowed up Plymouth, and brought Maine under its ban.† Connecticut was exceedingly shy of it, so far back as A. D. 1638, (Savage's Winthrop i. 284;) and may perhaps congratulate herself on an escape from a long and encircling arm. All this illustrates the ceaseless ambition for soil and revenue, which hovered around Boston Bay. As Papal Rome claims to be the Mother and Mistress of Churches, so Puritan Massachusetts aspired to be the Mother and Mistress of Colonies. And why? Because, doubtless, she was as sincere in her belief as Rome is, that *her* rule only in Church and State could set the world right, and keep its foundations from getting "out of course." But all this tallies strangely with the theory, that all the Puritans wanted here was, to be "allowed to worship their Creator according to the dictates of their consciences, without molestation."

NOTE 59, p. 86.

It is remarkable that the Pelagians, &c., of President Clap's day, ninety years since, made the same complaint of Congregationalism, which the *quasi* Pelagians of Connecticut make of the Church of England now. "So that according to these new reformers, the present most perfect reformation of Protestants contains the *roots and life of Popery;* and all our pretensions to it are but *in vain,* till we root out *some of the main articles* of our religion."—Pres. Clap's own italics. Discourse, &c. p. 34. Development had not reached such a crisis in Clap's day, as it has since.

* Neal's N. Eng. i. 21.—"A parliamentary speaker, in 1774, speaks of the island of New England." Eliot's Biog. Dict. p. 143, note.

† For the beginning of the Massachusetts warfare upon Maine, see Williamson's Maine, i. 333, 334, &c. Massachusetts was shy enough of Maine, when Episcopal influence prevailed there. Pp. 293, 297.

What would he now say to see Congregational Connecticut absolutely split into two parties, with two theological schools arrayed against each other!

NOTE 60, p. 87.

Episcopalians may afford to bear this better, when I assure them the Methodists, (than whom none profess a greater horror of Popery,) ought to grant them sympathy. For, this accusation of Popery has reached and attainted John Wesley himself! In this country, Wesley was denounced as a Papist, because he, like a true Puseyite, mixed wine with the water at Communions, and denied the validity of non-Episcopal baptisms.* An account of these and other popish tendencies in Wesley, and the noise they made in Georgia, when Wesley was on his mission there, may be seen in Tailfer's, &c., Georgia, p. 42. It has no date, but Rich, in his Bibliotheca, thinks it was printed at London in 1741. (Rich's Biblioth. ii. 64.)

NOTE 61, p. 88.

They could call the Church of Rome an anti-christian one, and say that the Church of England was *never* a true Church; (Gangraena, Pt. I. p. 25;) yet when a bold Baptist said the same of themselves, they whipped him soundly, and would have fined him into the bargain, but he was too poor! (Savage's Wint. ii. 174, 175.) Fortunate man! poverty was a mercy to him. However, there is a word more to be added: they did not whip him "for his opinion," says the journalist, with exquisite coolness. And he adds, moreover, an incidental proof of the "vivida virtus" with which the flagellation was administered: "He endured his punishment with much obstinacy." Alas, poor Baptist! it would have been hard enough to mangle thy wretched body only. To scourge thy memory forever, seems too much like imitating those annual execrations which His Holiness of Rome dispenses for the admiration of the faithful.

NOTE 62, p. 89.

What a marvellous contrast, by the way, between the conduct of these outcast Papists of Maryland and the Puritans of New England, upon the grand subject of religious liberty! Papists could tolerate: Puritans could not. The "fault of the age" was to persecute, and the Puritans could not avoid falling in with and imitating it. But Papists could rise above

* This was not the first, nor the twentieth time, Wesley was accused of Popery. Even the meek and quiet Moravians accused him of it. Lavington's Enthusiasm of Papists and Methodists compared, Pt. ii. 179. ed. 1749.

this seducing example, and show themselves gracious to heretics. Not so the Puritans. While Lord Baltimore's followers in Maryland were opening their doors to shelter all who bore the Christian name, the Puritans in New England were shedding Christian blood for crimes against their religion. Never more, then, be it said, that the fault of the age, or the prevailing character of the times, can excuse them; or, if it be, let it be remembered that *American* Papists ask for no such excuse, and that if the excuse be good, *European* Papists may justly plead it; and thus, by Puritan logic, defend all the enormities of the Inquisition. So here, again, is another of those points of proximity which meet us at every corner, between those who follow the Pope, properly so called, and those who make a Pope of their own private judgment, and say magisterially to others, "Bow down, that we may go over." (Isa. li. 23.)*

There is something more curious still, in the history of this Papal settlement in Maryland, of which the Puritans in England had been the virtual and compulsory causes. It was not enough for these exiled Papists to found a government, under which, says Mr. Bancroft, "*religious liberty obtained a home—its only home in the wide world.*" (Bancroft, i. 247.) As the author just quoted shows, they tendered all that home's comforts, privileges, and opportunities, with the largest liberty, to the Puritans themselves!! "Ever intent on advancing the interests of his colony, Lord Baltimore invited the Puritans of Massachusetts to emigrate to Maryland, offering them lands and privileges, and 'free liberty of religion.'" (Bancroft, i. 253. Savage's Winthrop, ii. 148, 149. Trumbull's U. States, p. 95.) Was there ever a stranger spectacle, in the history of religious antipathies? Was good ever more emphatically returned for evil? This was in 1642; and yet, in the latest charter the Puritans ever obtained, (in 1691,) the only feature tolerable to them was its intolerance to Roman Catholics. Oh, Puritanism! I love Rome as little as you profess to love her; and yet I must say, here is Rome herself putting you to the blush, and heaping coals of fire upon your head!

And most wonderful! the height of the contrast between the Papists of Maryland, and the Puritans of New England, is not reached still. In the brief period of twelve years, power in Maryland changed hands. In consequence of the Revolution at home, the Puritans became ascendant there, in 1654. And how, now in turn, did they treat those friendly Papists who would have proved their benefactors? To answer this question in their own favorite way, "Yet did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgat him." They forgot every thing, but that "might gives right."

* No wonder that from their imitations of Judaism, old Howell calls the Puritans "Jews of the New Testament."—Letters, Book iv. Lett. 43.

Even Mr. Bancroft does not hesitate to half scourge them thus: "The Puritans, ever the friends of popular liberty, hostile to monarchy, and equally so to a hereditary proprietary, contended earnestly for every civil liberty; but had neither the gratitude to respect the rights of the government by which they had been received and fostered, nor magnanimity to continue the toleration to which alone they were indebted for their residence in the colony." (Bancroft, i. 261.) How Mr. Bancroft can praise them as the friends of liberty, with one breath, and with another, reproach them as destitute of gratitude, magnanimity, and tolerance, when compared with votaries of the Popedom, is a mystery which may rank with transubstantiation. It would be hard to believe one's own eyes, if it were not proved by staring evidences, how reluctantly some forego their habits of praising men, whom Papists long and long before outdid in their latest virtues. But like the decree of old, "Delenda est Carthago," the decree of modern times, "Laudandi sunt Puritani," has become with multitudes a second nature.

This note is long, but I cannot refrain from adding, that with a characteristic want of forbearance, the Puritans in Maryland not only punished Papists, but all others who presumed to differ from themselves. "The Catholics," says Mr. Graham, "were not the only parties who experienced the severity of the new government. The Protestant Episcopalians were equally excluded from the protection of law; and a number of Quakers, having resorted soon after to the province and begun to preach against judicial oaths and military pursuits, were denounced by the government as heretical vagabonds, and subjected to the punishment of flogging and imprisonment." (N. America, ii. 30.)

NOTE 63, p. 90.

It seems somewhat equivocal, (even granting the claim assumed,) to bolster up the Puritans for their devotion to learning, when the same argument would answer a Papist, or a Saracen, equally well. Edwards (it is quite curious) is found commending the Papists for their love of learning, while he rebukes sectaries, (among whom he classes the Puritan Independents,) for their want and neglect of it. (See Preface to his Gangraena, p. vii.)

As to the Saracens, Mr. Ockley tells us "that when learning was quite lost in these western parts, it was restored by the Moors; to whom what philosophy was understood by the Christians was owing." (See Ockley's Saracens, Pref. p. xiv.) So that on the score of learning, a Saracen may hold his head even higher than a Puritan. And as to the Episcopalians of Virginia, it was not contempt of learning which retarded

their attention to the subject; for in 1621, when the Puritans had hardly landed on our shores, general education and a college were thought of. (Burk's Virginia, i. 225, 226.)

NOTE 64, p. 91.

Edwards in his Gangraena, pt. i. p. 48, says, "Julian was a great enemy to the learning of Christians—used all means to overthrow learning. So do many sectaries in our time." On p. 12, he identifies the Puritan Independents with these sectaries; as Hetherington does in *his* book, p. 196.

Walsh in his Appeal, says, p. 67, "The parliamentary party in England ostentatiously contemned all human learning, and were wholly indifferent to the object of general education."

Now for a testimony as to the state of things in New England. Cotton Mather's Magnalia was first published in 1702. At that time he thus confesses:—"But a good order has never yet been provided among us, that no untried person shall set up for a preacher, and run about from town to town, getting into the too much unguarded pulpits, and threatening our holy religion with no little inconvenience."—Magnalia, ii. 466.

Yet again. Let us hear President Chauncey, in one of his sermons at Cambridge, the day after one of their commencements, and when he wanted to rebuke the whole land, and the best of it. "There be many in the country that account it their happiness to live in the waste, howling wilderness, without any ministry or schools, and means of education for their posterity." These, I suppose, are the backwoodsmen: so let us try a more hopeful class. "Some little good they apprehend in it," he says of them, "to have a minister to spend the Sabbath, and to baptize their children, and schools to teach their children, and keep them out of harm's way, or teach them to write and read and cast accounts; but they despise the angels' bread." (Magnalia, i. 429.) No doubt I shall be told Dr. Chauncey drew on his imagination somewhat, and used rhetoric freely. Did he do so, when in his last will and testament he talked about the hell-bred superstitions of the Church of England? (Magnalia, i. 421.)

Lastly, indifference to learning, the "low and languishing state" of the college and "other inferior schools," is mentioned as one of the deplorable evils which render a second reformation necessary for New England. And the authority confesses, the indifference had grown with their growth: "it is deeply to be lamented that now, when we are many and more able," &c. The case was different "when New England was poor, and we were but few."—See "Results of Three Synods," Boston, 1725, pp. 116, 117.

NOTE 65, p. 93.

As to its love of power in magistrates, Puritanism once tried to found a government in Massachusetts, whose officers were to hold a place for life! Messrs. Winthrop, Dudley and Vane, were to be the *triumviri* of the new dynasty. (Felt's Salem, pp. 96, 97.) But Mr. Felt does not tell us, what Mr. Emerson is candid enough to do, that this project was "made manifest from the Scriptures!" (Emerson's First Ch. p. 26.)

"The object of this change in the constitution," observes the more candid Mr. Savage, "I discover, not in the Holy Scriptures, but in Cotton's Epistle to Lord Say." (Sav. Wint. i. 184, note.) But it mattered not. Cotton's version of Scripture was *the* Scripture of Massachusetts. (Hubbard's N. Eng. p. 182.) And as to the expertness of the Puritan ministers, in perverting Scripture for their own purposes, it was quite equal to that of the Romish Divines, as described by Erasmus in his "Praise of Folly"—another of their many points of similitude with Popery. Indeed, Erasmus seems to be picturing them prophetically, when he says, "They can deal with any text of Scripture as with a nose of wax, knead it into what shape best suits their interest; and whatever conclusions they have dogmatically resolved upon, they would have them as irrepealably ratified as Solon's laws, and in as great force as the very decrees of the Papal Chair." This is a perfect description of both the Puritan-Papist and the Puritan-Protestant.—See Erasmus on Folly, London, 1709, p. 109; and compare some curious and amusing instances, on his pages 152, 153.

NOTE 66, p. 95.

Puritans are not aware, that this ad captandum appeal to *names*, *numbers*, or *success*, is one of Rome's favorite ways of settling the question in her favor. If they were, they would not use it. See Stavely's Romish Horse-leech, Epistle Dedic. pp. 28, 29.

One of Cardinal Bellarmine's notes of the true Church is, the efficacy of its doctrines. But who has not heard the validity of Presbyterian ordination defended, because of the converts made by its preachers—in revivals more particularly? This is appealing to Bellarmine's ninth note; and no doubt it would have specially gratified his Eminence to have retorted it upon the Puritans. (Bellarmine's Notes refuted. New edit. 1840, p. 221.)

NOTE 67, p. 95.

Lightfoot was thoroughly satisfied, by his experiments with Puritanism, and became a sounder Churchman than ever. "He was a great

enemy to schism and faction, and uncharitable separation from the Church; and did use to press communion both in his sermons and ordinary discourses."* (Lightfoot's Works, Pitman's edit. i. 117.)

Lightfoot defended forms of prayer, too, even under a Puritan regime; for he preached in their behalf in 1655—at Cambridge University also. Truly he was a strange Puritan! For the sermon, see his Works, vi. 417.

NOTE 68, p. 95.

Master Cotton loved power dearly, when it was in his own hands. He showed this, amply, in the two treatises alluded to, and in some others. For example, in a critique on a work of Mr. Hendon, who had advocated toleration, he tells us who may and who may not have tender consciences, and of course who may and who may not be tolerated. "Tender consciences and true grace may meet in one subject; and none indeed are truly of tender conscience, but such as are truly gracious." That is, gracious in his eye; and then comes in the well-known Puritan prerogative to judge of every body's piety, just as Whitfield did of Ap. Tillotson's, and to send all who do not suit its fancy straight to the worst of places, as Whitfield did this good man. (See Cotton's tract, edition of 1656, p. 3, for the quotation.)

As to his love of the Power of the Keys, he transmitted this so fully, that the day came when there was supposed to be a Presbyterian conspiracy to subdue New England under synods, &c. Wise, in his "Churches' Quarrel Espoused," told its abettors that they had outkinged all kings, outbishoped all bishops, and outpoped the Pope. (See his book, p. 80. Boston, 1772.) If he had been near enough to Master Cotton's day, to have whispered such wholesome counsel in his ear, it might have been as good as hellebore to thickening blood.

Cotton's prelatical spirit was translated into Connecticut. Thomas Hooker, of Hartford, his cotemporary in his Church Polity,† maintains

* From his Address, I supposed Dr. Bacon ignorant of Lightfoot's return to the Church. Yet in his Hist. Discourses, p. 35, he professes to be aware of the fact, and still persists in calling Lightfoot a Puritan. Would he were such an one himself.

† The very lofty opinion once entertained by the Puritans of *their* Hooker, is manifest from the following language of (I presume) Mr. Foxcroft, of Boston, to Dr. Johnson, of Stratford. "If he has a Richard Hooker to boast of, we have a Thomas Hooker to match him. 'The Survey of Church Discipline' wears, for aught I see, as venerable a hoary head as the 'Ecclesiastical Polity.'"—See reply to Eleutherius Enervatus. Boston, 1733, p. 2.

It is important for Churchmen to know, that a book of Puritanic Connecticut, long since surrendered to oblivion and bookworms, is the equal of the immortal work

that, "the supreme magistrate hath liberty and power both to inquire and judge of professions and religions, which is true and ought to be maintained, which is false and ought to be rejected." Again, "If the magistrate is bound to maintain the peace of his subjects in godliness, and to know and judge of the ways of godliness; then he must have power to use such means that he may both know and maintain it." (T. Hooker's Survey of Ch. Discipline, pt. iv. pp. 57, 58. London, 1648.) The pow ers Hooker gives the magistrate ought to have made himself conform to the religion of Charles I. But, alas, when an Episcopalian exercised them he was a tyrant; because, doubtless, he was not "truly gracious."

The high-churchism of Cotton and Hooker went further in Connecticut than in Massachusetts: witness the "consociation" system, a *via media* between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism *puris naturalibus.** It made some lordly disciples, as Mr. William Hart's reply to Noah Hobart, about the great Wallingford case,† evinces; where, on p. 45, he complains of the sad increase of what he calls "Diotrephenism." Is there any of the old Diotrephian spirit left? Who are the virtual bishops of Congregational Connecticut, i. e., of its old and new school sections?

I am constrained to close this note with another quotation from Mr. John Wise. "The very name of an arbitrary government is ready to put an *English* man's blood [I follow copy] into a fermentation, but when it really comes and shakes its whip over their ears, and tells them it is their master, it makes them stark mad; and being of a mimical genius, and inclined to follow the court mode, they turn arbitrary too."—(Churches' Quarrel Espoused, p. 79.) Mr. Wise meant this as an explanatory theory for some of his Puritan brethren; who, low-church in *England*, became high-church in *Massachusetts*. Verily, if high-churchmanship consists in being arbitrary, the world has produced no higher churchmen than the Puritans.

NOTE 69, p. 106.

When I wrote the letters of 1835, I was assailed as a conspirator, attempting to sow discords between the Puritans and the Dutch, and defended myself in the following terms:

"Really, among all my wildest imaginings, I could never have ex-

of the profound Episcopalian. Would that I could give extracts from Dr. Johnson's reply to Mr. Foxcroft, and to which Mr. F. never rejoined. But the book is not in my possession. It is referred to in Chandler's Johnson, p. 70.

* See "Congregational Order," published at Middletown, Connecticut, 1843, p 291, etc.

† For this case, see Trumbull's Connecticut, ii. 480.

cogitated such a possibility; for my opinion has been (a stranger's ignorance is excusable if I am incorrect) that the points of proximity between the very respectable Dutch Church and our own were much more numerous, than between that Church and Puritan meeting-houses.* Some things in the Intelligencer and Churchman (Dutch and Episcopal Church papers) led me to suppose so. And this was any thing but surprising to me. I remembered how the author of the 'European Settlements,' said 'they were watched.' I remembered how Mr. Bozman, one of the best of our American historians, said 'they had not lived at Amsterdam more than a year, before ambition, through which even angels are said to have fallen, set these "holy brethren and exiled saints" by the ears.' (Hist. of Maryland, p. 200.) I remembered how Chief Justice (I beg pardon, my hope 'was father to that thought') Story characterized their consummate selfishness and alienation from all Christians of every name. 'The truth of history compels us to admit, that from the first settlement down to the charter of William and Mary in 1692, [1691,] in proportion as they gathered internal power, they were less and less disposed to share it with any other Christian sect.' (Hist. Disc. p. 51.) I remembered how the people, who doubted the sincerity of their King, and said that a charter with 'a seal as broad as the house-floor,' (Hazard, i. 361,) would be good for nothing; also doubted the sincerity of their excellent Dutch friends, who allowed them 'sweetly to enjoy their Church liberty.' I remembered how their writers (New England's Memorial, e. g., Davis's edit., pp. 31, 34,) had upbraided the Dutch for bribing† the Captain of the

* I employ this term, now growing rather obsolete among those who once contended strenuously for its use, to remind my readers of the past. I was once present at a Congregational parish meeting in Connecticut, where a fierce dispute arose whether the edifice in which they were assembled should be called *church* or *meeting-house*. It was voted, after much sharp and learned debate, that it was a *church*. And why not? If a *vote* can make a minister, it were a pity if it could not make a church for him too. I also use the term by the way of counterpart to the gracious appellation formerly given to Episcopal churches in this country, viz. "Church of England buildings." (See Mass. Hist. Collect., 1st series, iii. 106.) The curious should read the whole letter from which I quote. The exertions of the Rev. Mr. Sayre (Missionary at Fairfield) in behalf of our countrymen, when that place was attacked by Gov. Tryon, his earnest intercessions for their property, his fearless intrepidity in bearing a flag, when "the flames were raging and bullets flying," and the burning down of "the Church of England building," *not by the British*, are worthy commemoration by some one of Connecticut's many able Episcopal pens. Connecticut is a rich field for the annalists of our Church. May she soon provoke some of her worthy sons to traverse it faithfully, and permit the now living to enter into his labors.

† This story about Dutch bribery is at length given up. Compare Bancroft's U States, vol. i. 333, first edition: and vol i. 309, seventh edition. Young, in his Chron

Mayflower, by 'fraudulency and contrivance,' not to land them near their own settlements, but something more than a 'sabbath-day's journey' distant: a tolerable proof, by the way, how much the Dutch loved them, even if the 'allegation,' as Mr. Bozman calls it, be true. (Hist. Maryland, 209.) I remembered how they assaulted the Dutch with bitter charges, almost as soon as they had established their Massachusetts settlement, of 'a constant course of opposition, injuries, and many hostile affronts.' (Hazard, ii. 212.) I remembered how their Anabaptist excommunicates fled to the Dutch for shelter. (Savage's Winthrop, ii. 124.) And lastly, I remembered what tender admonitions, in their ostensibly better moods, they offered to their former hospitable entertainers, or their countrymen, it matters little which. Out of 'love and affection,' they bade them beware how they came too near their precincts. Why? Lest the sea-serpent swallow them down whole? No: but lest 'peradventure they [their own seamen] will make prize of you if they can.' (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st series, iii. 53.) What an apt illustration of the New York Observer's commentary on their disposition to forget injuries! They remembered *benefits* so well, that because the Dutch in Holland granted them the greatest boon on earth—a free conscience—they, when 3000 miles off, would allow them, in return, (magnanimous requital!) to catch —not a solitary fish in their broad waters: waters, by the way, which the poor Dutchmen claimed, not by courtesy, but by right—a right which they, who never came here to make money, felt in *conscience* bound to dispute. All this, too, when, only a short time after, they, with their usual *consistency*, acknowledge their obligations of gratitude. (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st series, iii. 55.) Everlasting commemoration be the due of such profoundly grateful recollections!

"Calling to mind things like this savory series, I never wondered that the Dutch were willing to disburse a few compliments, in order to get rid of their unpromising visitants. Doubtless they had a milder and more gentlemanly way of removing disagreeable associates than had the Puritans. Unlike Endicott and his homogeneous clan, concerning whose tender mercies, says Dr. Bentley, (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st series, vi. 245,) 'they who could not be terrified into silence were not commanded to

icles, repudiates it. See p. 102, notes. He says Moulton, in his history of New York, was the first to question it. This is a loose remark; for Bozman in his Maryland, gave it but as a rumor, and with hesitation; and even Robertson, in his America, doubts it, for he gives it as a saying of the day merely.—Bozman, pp. 209, 210, notes.

One thing however is clear, from the string of historians cited by Young, that the Puritans clung to the tale about Dutch treachery, *as long as they could*. And just so long will they cling to tales which defame Episcopalians. No matter, however, if their temper in such cases is but accurately understood.

withdraw, but they were seized and transported as criminals;' unlike these, I say, the Dutch did not *kick*, but *bowed* intruders out of doors. I like the Dutch, Mr. Editor; they were largely liberal, as soon as, if not sooner than any people in Europe or the world; their honesty (Puritan vituperation to the contrary notwithstanding) and their contentment are proverbial; and steady if they be in adherence to their own notions, they are not remarkable, as some have been, and still are, for languishing and declining when not sustained by what Bozman happily calls 'the nourishing dew of persecution;' (Hist. Maryland, 376;) nor for neglecting to take 'heed of too great straitness and singularity,' in the matter of Christian courtesy, as some have done in spite of solemn warning from 'assured lovers and friends;' (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st series, iii. 28;) nor as some have been, and have yet the will to be, for notorious domineering, dictating, proscribing, and even worse things, and then 'sanctifying' the whole by that convenient, but most profaned and prostituted word, '*sincerity*.' Sincerity, thinks the New York Observer, is an excuse for saying, if not doing, any thing to one's neighbor, no matter how ill-timed or unacceptable. Indeed! Let me wonder if the sincerity of a Papist would with that journal be a passport for a good round Trentine anathema, or even exonerate the 'bad style' of your correspondent, when ripping up the well-sewed secrets of a couple of centuries. Did the sincerity of a late able refuter of a traveller's calumnies against the Church of England, procure his remarks a place in that journal's columns? (See Churchman for January 31, 1835.) This unfortunate Observer, Mr. Editor, seems to be suffering as did Leah of old, (Gen. xxix. 17,) and to have grown, perhaps, in consequence, amazingly rheumy. He denounces me for want of complaisance, and then—possibly, because troubled by his eyes, he did not see what a text he was preaching from—broadly insinuates that neither my Episcopal brethren nor myself believe the standards of our Church. If, Mr. Editor, *our* clergy were to say, as has been done again and again of his own standards, and under a solemn examination before a presbytery, that they believed them 'only for substance,' doubtless this would not be enough for poor unworthy Episcopalians; but the answer must be made to them, as to the brow-beaten remonstrants of 1646, 'You are not to enjoy the liberty wherewith we are set free.' But, after all, I am not so thoroughly displeased with my critic's rheum or rheumatism (as either term may suit) as he supposes. I view his spasms with as much self-complacency as does a tired physician the effects of a medicine, which has AT LAST begun to do its work on an obstinate constitution. If, in my self-defending severity (just such severity as Bancroft says (i. 463) was used by the Puritans, and certainly just such as was

used by the *very sincere* William Laud,) I have made him smart a little, let me beg him to be 'patient in tribulation,' for the chastisement may be salutary. I commend to him, while experiencing my prescriptions, Prov. xiii. 24. Old Master Moody, of most famous pedagogical memory, was accustomed to require the uneasy to read the entire book of Proverbs: I will only advise for him a single verse."

NOTE 70, p. 108.

Dr. Dwight is bold enough to say, "The creed of these men [Puritans] was in substance the same with that of your own Church [of England] and that of the Protestant Churches generally;" (Travels, i. 165;) yet it is notorious, that their ideas about the sanctity of the Lord's day have been peculiar to themselves. Roger Williams told them, long ago, what "the famous Calvin and thousands more held" respecting it. (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st ser. i. 281.) But Calvin and his thousands they followed not.*

Nay, transcending even God himself in consecrating *one* day, they consecrated Saturday and Sunday nights as equally sacred, and guarded their observance by the same penalties!! (See Massachusetts Law of 1692, or p. 15, edit. 1714; also Connecticut Laws, edit. 1769, pp. 139, 140.) Nay more, though Christmas, &c. had been proscribed by fine, *their own*, Thanksgivings and Fasts are fortified by the same penalties which guarded Sunday. And were these heavy? Why, Massachusetts, down to 1726, and very much later for aught I know, would put a man in a cage (this detestable instrument of public torture not yet extinguished) for absenting himself from Puritan worship for a month together. (See Laws, edit. 1726, p. 252.)

By the way, how curiously the extension of holy time to an additional evening every week, and to holy-days of an indefinite number, compares with the old established Puritan principle, "that the Scripture must be the rule to direct in all things, even so far as to the 'taking up of a rush or straw.'"† See proem to the second book of Richard, *not* Thomas, Hooker's Ecc. Polity.

* Some of these thousands were, notwithstanding, quite favorable to the observance of Christmas, Easter, &c. See "Judgment of the Reformed Churches of Holy Days."—Proceedings of the Assembly at Perth in Scotland, Lond. 1621, Pt. iii. 79, etc. The Synod of Dort kept the Festival of the Nativity for three days. See pp. 84, 85.—Compare Bingham's Works, ix. 251.

† When Master Cotton had to contend with the Baptists, and they employed this old Puritan principle against infant baptism, he told them the Devil helped them to such a notion!!—Benedict's Baptists, i. 362, 363.

NOTE 71, p. 112.

Cushman rebuked his Plymouth friends in 1621, in the following good round terms. "Men may make a great appearance of respect unto God, and yet but dissemble with him, having their own lusts carrying them; and, out of doubt, men that have taken in hand hither to come, out of discontentment in regard to their estates in England, and aiming at great matters here, affecting it to be gentlemen, landed men, or hoping for office, place, dignity, or fleshly liberty." Could they who landed for conscience' sake in 1620, require such preaching as this in 1621? But the fact speaks for itself; though I by no means give all Cushman's plain speaking. (Young's Chronicles, p. 263.)

NOTE 72, p. 120.

Hutchinson says the proposal to bribe the king was a trick of Cranfield's—a governor of New Hampshire, who owed Massachusetts a grudge, for having felt some of the reachings of its "engrasping" arm. Be it so. By Hutchinson's own confession, the bait took; for he adds, "The court," i. e. the General Court of Massachusetts, for Cranfield was *at Boston* when he advised them what to do—"The court agreed to the proposal." (Hutchinson, i. 303.) The General Court, then, were nothing loth to try bribes; and that is all that I am concerned to show.

While upon this subject of underhand dealing, I must quote two authorities more.

A letter of Shirley, a Plymouth agent, shows how freely bribes could be given. He says thus to Governor Bradford: "But as Festus said to Paul, with *no small sum* obtained I this freedom; [i. e. of access to the ear of the Lord Keeper;] for, by the way, there were many riddles which must be resolved, and many locks must be opened with the silver, nay the golden key." (Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. iii. 70.) These men,* like John Cotton, would not bend *the knee* at the Eucharist, though but for a solitary time, to gain the Church's favor; (Magnalia, i. 237;) but they could bend *conscience* like a willow withe, at the shrine of Mammon, to promote their worldly interest.

And now for my last testimony, on this humiliating subject. Says a New England Review, "Old politicians, grown gray in practices of artifice and deception, could never have discovered more simulation than our General Court, in their apologies for not joining the other colonies, when Connecticut was threatened with invasion by the Dutch at Manhadoes; and which would actually have taken place, had not Oliver Cromwell, by

* "I write here," says Shirley, "in the behalf of *all* our partners." P. 71.

his threats, annihilated all their bold resolutions." (Monthly Anthology. Boston, 1809, vii. 63, 64.)

This picture of Massachusetts, by *her own children*, is far more formidable than any of my painting. It shows, first, how little the Puritans cared for the lives of their own brethren, if they could save their own pockets—next, that Oliver Cromwell was their superior in charity—and lastly, that Talleyrand himself could not have surpassed them in duplicity:—and all this by a Massachusetts pen!!

NOTE 73, p. 124. (Last line of the foot notes.)

This exeedingly sensitive spot in the annals of Puritanism was noticed by the Presbyterian Baillie, in his "Dissuasive from the errors of the times." Master Cotton in his reply to him and Mr. Rutherford, another Presbyterian who had assailed Puritan Independency, *alias* Congregationalism, felt the point of Mr. Baillie's spear as acutely as Mr. Young; who quotes Cotton with great eagerness as a Goliath against Baillie, on p. 380 of his Chronicles. But what is Cotton's overwhelming authority? Nothing but the simple assertion of the "Pilgrims" themselves: somewhat interested witnesses, as all must grant. "Themselves do declare it," (is Cotton's annihilating answer to Mr. Baillie,) that you are totally in the wrong. (Way of the Cong. Churches cleared, &c., p. 14. London. 1648.) And then he proceeds to give, as *he himself doth declare*, "their own words;" when he cuts those words into a shape that better suited his own fancy—giving, as I have said, but *four* reasons out of *five*, and leaving out, among other things, all allusion to their "being desirous rather to enlarge his Majesty's dominions, and to live under their natural Prince." All this is plain enough. Cotton was writing in the days of the Parliament, when it would have been rather awkward to talk about the loyalty of the "Pilgrims," to an authority they were then full willing to disown. So Cotton quietly dodges that difficulty, by the slight sin of omission.

But let such matters pass. Analyzed thus, what is Cotton's assertion worth more than Baillie's? Who will say the *ipse dixit* of the Congregationalist is better than that of the Presbyterian?

We are then thrown back upon the "Pilgrims" themselves; and their own story has been given by Secretary Morton, and commented on quite enough probably, any Puritan will without doubt say.

However, there are one or two collateral matters, which may be subjoined here.

It speaks not over well for the "Pilgrims," that the archbishop would not favor them. (See Hazard's Collect. i. 361. Young's Chronicles,

p. 56.) Some will say, By no means: this was of course to be expected, from such a man as Laud. Laud, reader? Why Laud was not then so much as a plain bishop. This was in 1618; while Laud was not a bishop till 1621, nor an archbishop till 1633. The archbishop in question was George Abbot, the Calvinist, and the devoted patron of nonconformists, and opponent of the Book of Sports!* And *he* look with a cold eye upon our Leyden friends? There is something in this very strange, and very suspicious. Abbot knew Robinson in England; for he left England just about as Abbot had entered on his archiepiscopate. He had doubtless read Bishop Hall against the Brownists, *alias* Bishop Hall against John Robinson; and he distrusted a man who, having called his ecclesiastical mother a harlot, now came cap in hand to solicit her smiles.

Another thing. Why does Robinson, in his parting letter to the "Pilgrims," dwell so intently upon the necessity of their peace with one another? Why warn them against that "touchy humor," which even to this day has lost none of its testiness in their descendants? Why tell them that they, "above others," should be most cautious to guard against it? I leave these questions for my readers' own reflections, and add but the reference to the letter itself. (Young's Chronicles, pp. 92, 93. Or, Mass. H. Coll. 2d ser. ix. 30.)

Perhaps however I ought to say, that Robinson's caution was zealously followed up in 1624 by the agents of Plymouth in England. They warn the "Pilgrims" against "hatred or heartburning," "long and sharp disputes." (Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. iii. 30.)

Notwithstanding, the version of Puritan perfection in Cotton Mather is, that "*God sifted three nations, that he might bring choice grain into*

* I do not remember giving a Churchman's apology for the Book of Sports. The design was to keep people from going back to Romanism, in consequence of the horrors of a Puritan sabbath; a breach of which Master Cotton would have punished with death. (Hutch. Collect. pp. 161, 173.) It was an error, doubtless, but a *sincere* one; and therefore harmless, according to Puritan logic, and quite excusable. Sincerity, as we shall by and by see, covers up all defects. Even Hutchinson is beguiled into the common cant about sincerity. (Hutch. Hist. i. 175.) For an authority on the Church side about the Book of Sports, see Bp. Montague's Articles of Enquiry, Cambridge edit. 1841. pp. 86, 121.—Poor Bishop Montague wrote against Popery, as well as Archbishop Laud; but was considered as a concealed Papist of the most malignant kind. Nevertheless, on the very page where he asks a clergyman if he had read the Book of *Lawful* Sports, according to the King's order, he also asks a question, which the ministers of Puritanic Massachusetts could not answer very favorably, with tee-totalism in temperance to help them. It is this. "Do any in your parish buy or sell, or keep open their shops, or set out any wares to be sold on Sundays or Holy Days, by themselves, their servants, or apprentices?"

this wilderness." (Magnalia, i. 219.) Alas, for our degeneracy, if the siftings of three nations, by *Heaven's* own hand, need so much re-sifting from the hand of *man!*

NOTE 74, p. 132.

It is indeed most amusing to a philosophical observer to remark, what some good people can do, most complacently, who would be shocked, unspeakably, by a *Romish* devotion to relics. Thus we have the chair of the Dairyman's Daughter exhibited on a public platform, and the museum at Worcester, Mass., matching, I dare say, any of the mortuaries, &c., at Rome. Thus also Mary Chilton, who first touched the Rock, converted into a St. Catharine or St. Agnes—not to use a loftier name. And, what outstrips them all, we have a chip of the "Sanctified Rock" cut out and inserted into the "Church of the Pilgrims" in Brooklyn, L. I.; and, as I am told by an eyewitness, at the convenient height of the foot of St. Peter's image at Rome, so that one can kiss it if he should feel inclined that way.

Now I have no objection to this veneration of relics, if people choose to indulge it; but it is abominable to abuse a Romanist for indulging it, and then do the same thing ourselves. But only see how the worshippers, (i. e., worshippers in the sense of the Douay Bible) of the "Sanctified Rock" show their horror of a *Romish* superstition. It would have been profane to put the cross over it; so they put Neptune's trident there!!! This at least was the proposition, fully assented to, in the Columbian Centinel. Whether carried into execution, I cannot say.

How curiously the erection of a *heathen* symbol over the "Sanctified Rock," compares with the cutting a *Christian* symbol out of the flag of Massachusetts! And notice also the singular language of Mrs. Adams, when she "visited the church at Leyden, in which our forefathers worshipped." She did not feel the veneration of a Christian—oh, no—but "like what the ancients paid to their Druids," i. e., the veneration of a Pagan idolater! (Letters of Mrs. Adams, Boston, 1840, ii. 150.) And Mr. Young quotes this with admiration! (Chronicles, p. 393.) I must adduce here the language of a Presbyterian, which will come up again, but it will not spoil by repetition. "It is ever true of mankind, that if their reverence for eminent departed saints respects their *persons* merely, and not their *religious belief*, it degenerates into something approaching man-worship or idolatry." (Lit. and Theol. Rev., New-York, 1839, vol. vi. 186.)*

* The author of Mercurius Rusticus saw this and remarked it, long ago. "They have their idols and their idolatry, as much as the Church of Rome." He said this of their man-worship.—Merc. Rus. Pt. ii. 141.

NOTE 75, p. 135. (Last line but one of the foot notes.)

These great men would not leave England, unless they could carry the Charter with them. (Chalmers' Annals, p. 150, and Hutchinson's Hist. i. 19, 20.) In order to please them, it was conveyed over, and by stealth! (Chalmers' Revolt of the Colonies, i. 44, 49.) Thus the government of Massachusetts was begun by that "simulation," her own children have ascribed to her: see Note 72. And when England discovered the sly conduct of the settlers of Massachusetts, and began to exercise a privilege, not only her natural right, but a right expressly reserved by the Charter*—of preventing persons going to Massachusetts, she is called a bitter persecutor! England was willing to let those go who would be loyal, i. e., as we shall see, take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy. But was it not natural, inevitable, I may say, for her to suspect those who would purloin her charter, and then run off without giving any token of loyalty? If the magistrate, according to Thomas Hooker, not only has the power, but "*is bound* to know and judge of the ways of godliness," (Summe of Church Discipline, Pt. iv. 58,) surely he is bound to look after such ways and doings, and to see how they affect "the nationality" of his country.

NOTE 76, p. 140.

See what Higginson said in 1629, to induce emigrants to come over, i. e., "you that are rich!" Their children and families "may live as well, both for soul and body, as any where in the world." He closes with saying, "While I was writing this letter, my wife brought me word that the fishers had caught 1600 bass, at one draught, which if they were in England were worth many a pound." (Hutchinson's Collect. pp. 48, 50.)

Edward Winslow † talks in the same style, when he wants to toll the rich over in 1621—so early a date even as that! "By the goodness of God we are so far from want, that we often wish you partakers of our plenty." Then, "fresh cod in the summer is but coarse meat with us;" and then such an array of strawberries, gooseberries, raspberries, plums, and roses, (Heaven save the mark!) as makes the very mouth of the reader water.‡ (Mass. H. Coll. 2d ser. ix. 60–62.)

* See Anc. Col. Laws, edit. 1814, p. 11, near the bottom. This is admitted by Bancroft, i. 343.

† Winslow is a Puritan author of much celebrity; and Mr. Young quotes largely from him, in the compilation of his Chronicles. But it should be carefully understood, that an honest Puritan contemporary accuses him of telling in one of his tracts, no less than "*forty lies.*" Hutch. Hist. i. 470.

‡ Compare the humiliating apology poor John Pratt had to make, for writing

No doubt the Puritans, having another object in view, could talk in a different style, after the fashion of their amusing and self-depreciating petition to Parliament in 1651, (see Hutchinson's Hist. i. 448,) when they were afraid Parliament would put obstacles in the way of "trading roundly;"* and wherein we have a studious display of their poverty, though the next year they established a mint to coin their own money! (Holmes' Annals, i. 297.)

But as they have told two very different stories, they cannot complain if their observers believe which of the two they please; both standing upon equal authority!

However, perhaps I may as well inform my reader, how some at least of the explanations of Puritan sufferings have become current. They were sick at first; as they were likely to be, in a new climate and an uncleared country, if surrounded with all life's appliances and means — And the mistake is, multitudes suppose they continued sick, no one knows how long. But let us hear an impartial annalist. "They found all the people they left so ill, lusty and well for all their poverties, except six that died." (J. Smith's Gen. Hist. edit. 1819, ii. 228.) They arrived in 1620, and Smith's date is about a year later!

Then writers like Belknap have helped this on. He pretends to quote Smith thus: "About an hundred Brownists went to New Plymouth; whose humorous ignorance caused them to endure a wonderful deal of misery with infinite patience." (Belknap's Biog. i. 317.) Now the genuine sentence is as follows; the words altered or omitted being put in italics for the sake of distinction. "About *some* hundred *of your* Brownists, *of England, Amsterdam, and Leyden,* went to New Plymouth; whose humorous *ignorances* caused them, *for more than a year,* to endure a wonderful deal of misery with *an* infinite patience." (Smith's Gen. Hist. i. 263.)

Is this the man who presumed so condescendingly to excuse Gov. Hutchinson for an "inattention," which he is quite willing, any one can see, to have imputed to a worse fault? (Belknap's Biog. ii. 158.) He leaves out the very pith and core of Smith's sentence, "for more than a year," that we may suppose the sufferings of the Puritans were of the severest and most protracted kind. And now may I not fairly say, it is easy to see how, in compositions less grave than history, (orations, poems, &c.,) still more partial representations have been made?

home that New England was a wretched place to live in.—Savage's Wint. i. 173.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d Ser. vii. 126.

* Among other things, the tariff was too high. The tide is now turned, and New England would fain see the Parliament back, to make the tariff a little higher. She should remember, however, that a high tariff is contrary to good Puritan doctrine.

NOTE 77, p. 142.

These oaths were not taken till 1676, when the Charter was trembling under a threatened *Quo Warranto*. (Hutchinson, i. 289.) On the contrary, there was a law forbidding any oath "but such as the General Court hath considered, allowed, and required"; and another requiring allegiance to Massachusetts, "by the great name of the ever-living God." The King is nowhere alluded to. (See Anc. Col. Laws, p. 171.)* But when they wanted his Charters, they were his "most humble subjects and suppliants."

NOTE 78, p. 142.

I have already remarked, that the king had expressly reserved to himself the right of prohibiting any person from settling in Massachusetts. (See note 75.) So his prohibition was but one of those chartered provisions, for which Massachusetts was so pertinaciously zealous. She there fore had no right to complain; especially after having run away with the Charter itself.

But now, let us look at the actual prohibition. It may be found in Hazard's Coll. i. 421. It is levelled against "promiscuous and disorderly departing out of the realm." It required that a subsidy man, i. e., a taxable man, one of the upper classes, should not go without license from his Majesty's Commissioners for Plantations; and that one under a subsidy-man, i. e., one of humble life, and likely to be made a tool of, that *he* should show, before he went, that he had taken the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and could produce a certificate from his minister of his "conformity to," not his "approbation of," the orders and discipline of the Church of England. As for the upper classes, they were "assured from some of the Council, that his Majesty did not intend to impose the ceremonies of the Church of England upon them, for that it was considered it was for the sake of freedom from those things the people went over thither." (Hutchinson's Hist. i. 37. Hubbard's N. Eng. p. 154.)†

So it is clear, all the king wanted, was to be assured the emigrants would be *loyal*. He and his ministry were justly alarmed, to find that the Charter bad been gone from England, for years, without their knowledge. (Chalmers' Revolt of the Amer. Col., i. 44, 49. Hutch. Hist., i. 37. Savage's Wint., i. 135, 137.) They wanted an immediate and effectual stop put to such a state of things. They were determined none

* "They acknowledged no standard but their own charter."—Washburn's Judicial History of Massachusetts, p. 83.

† The Charter did not grant even religious freedom, according to Judge Story.—Bancroft, i. 343.

should leave England, to plot against her. And this self-defensive act was the quintessence of persecution!!

And lastly, to crown my climax, behold the Puritans themselves doing the same thing, soon after they got over—actually trying to stop people from leaving Massachusetts, and that without making any exception about licenses, and throwing the whole colony into a ferment because they cannot compass their point! (See Chalmers' Annals, p. 160. Sav. Wint., i. 140.) And then, to make the cordon complete, actually passing laws prohibiting the entrance of strangers upon their jurisdiction, and that, too, the very year the king endeavored to prevent the departure of those, who would set him and his government at defiance; and still be all the while pretending to act under his chartered protection!! (See Savage's Wint., i. 224. Hutch. Hist. i. 63. Anc. Col. Laws, pp. 191, 192.)

NOTE 79, p. 158.

President Quincy is one of the most frank authorities upon this subject, that I have been able to find. He does not mince the matter, but says plumply, that the Puritans had "an utter detestation of the English hierarchy, service, and discipline." Moreover, he does not give them much credit for the Arabella letter, or any of their professions of friendship or allowance for the Church of England. He admits, what it is most important for me to notice, that they could be guilty of *duplicity*, and even of *falsehood*, to gain their ends. "Though compelled by circumstances, sometimes to conceal, and sometimes to deny this antipathy, it was in truth one of the master-passions in the breasts of those early emigrants, [he cannot say Pilgrims,] and constitutes a principal clew to their language, conduct, policy, and laws." (Harv. Univer., i. 351.) I have no doubt of the entire truth of the venerable President's statement; but I could not, as he appears to do, hold in lofty estimation, men who could conceal the existence of a master-passion—a passion spread over and tinging all their words and works—and when close pressed, stoutly deny it. This to me is downright Jesuitry; or plain equivocation and lying, disguise it rhetorically as you will.* I do not understand how a man is compelled, by circumstances which affect his worldly interest, to be guilty of such things. There is a plain Scripture for *this* subject, if not for *all* the peculiarities of Congregationalism, as I am perfectly ready to concede. And it is this: "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

* The Puritans themselves, of course, could not be expected to see this; fo Mr. Washburn assures us their very courts proceeded upon the loosest principles. "The courts of the colony seem to have paid little regard to the ordinary rules of evidence."—Judicial History of Massachusetts, p. 55.

NOTE 80, p. 162.

Mr. Brattle, in 1696, forbade a layman to officiate at his ordination. It was a deviation, says President Quincy, "from the established practice of the early Congregational churches." (Harv. Univer., i. 88, 89, comp. p. 489.) The so-called leather-mitten ordination proves, incontestably, the interference of the laity at Congregational ordinations. This was the ordination of Israel Chauncey, son of President Chauncey, and settled at Stratford, Connecticut. Here the brethren insisted on their right to lay on hands; in doing which one forgot to take off his leather mitten. Hence the name of the ordination. "It was not long after this," says Dr. Eliot, in his Dictionary, "that in Connecticut and Massachusetts the clergy deprived the brethren of this privilege." "But," adds he, with a perfect consciousness of the peculiarities of the Congregational system, "could we now refuse them if they insisted upon it?" (Eliot's Biog. Dict., p. 101. Pierce's Hist. Harv. Univer., p. 163. Compare Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d ser., i. 166.)

The editor of the Cambridge Platform of 1829 tries to get over a second and third ordination of the same person, upon his having a second or third congregation, by saying that the Platform makes no difference "between Ordination and Installation." (See Platform, 1829, p. 43.)* No difference indeed? It knows no such thing as an Installation—that is a modern manufacture, to cover up the absurdity of ordaining the same person (if need be) half a dozen times over. The Platform speaks of a man ordained a second time over a new congregation, as "again orderly called unto *office*:" by a second imposition of hands, also, and not as called unto a new *place* for an old office. Thus my readers will see the Congregationalists are ignorant of their own system, or artfully try to hide its defects. But no wonder: they can conceal or deny systematically, as President Quincy tells us, when circumstances require.

* Mr. Felt tries the same game. See his Annals of Salem, p. 207. But the artifice is too shallow for a Churchman. He understands the mysteries of ordination, &c., too well. The Congregationalists never impose hands at an Installation, any more than a bishop at an Institution. Moreover, such efforts as these of the Editor of the Platform, and of Mr. Felt, are shown to be superlatively effete, by a contemporary publication of the Presbyterians, levelled against the old Platform itself: I allude to the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici* of 1654. There the Congregationalists are duly taken to task, for the allowance of double, treble, &c. *ordinations*—not a word about *installation;* showing how modern a coinage that is. "Interpretatio contemporanea fortissima est." So Mr. Editor and Mr. Felt amount to nothing.—See *Jus Divinum*, Part First, pp. 145, etc.

It may be well enough to add here, that Bingham says these double and treble ordinations are a device and practice of Geneva. Calvin, whose ordination of any sort has been doubted, might willingly encourage such a practice.—Bingham's Works, ix. 308.

The fact is, a *genuine* Congregationalist considers himself not only as out of office, when he leaves a particular congregation, but out of the Church, too, till he unites himself with a new congregation!! Thus "Mr. Lathrop, who had been pastor of a private congregation in London," when he came over to Boston, durst not receive their Eucharist, although present at the ceremony, till he had been again taken formally into communion. (Sav. Wint. i. 144.) Dr. Eliot in his Dict. p. 293, says, "He met the ideas of our fathers upon this subject," and that Master Cotton (then not over) rebuked them for it. "I am constrained," he said, "to bear witness against your judgment and practice, that you think no man may be admitted to the sacrament, though a member of the Catholic Church, except he be a member of some particular church."* Master Cotton, it seems, had some little leaven of churchmanship left in him, till he reached Boston. Then he soon got rid of the uncomfortable exotic.

To add another anthority upon this curious subject. A magistrate *visiting* Salem, had a child born there. He wanted baptism for his infant, and the Communion for himself; and was refused both! (Felt's Salem, p. 526.) Here Cotton broke out, and showed his aristocratical temper, (he was then in Boston,) by saying that a godly magistrate had a right, as a magistrate, to the seals of the Covenant, be he where he might. This is farcical enough, and should be well remembered by all those Puritans, who have berated the administration of the Communion to new-made magistrates in England—a thing, however, now done away with.

NOTE 81, p. 163.

This subject of re-ordination puzzles the Editor of Winthrop's Journal, for he says "ordination by a bishop must have been thought valid." "But how it should be a sin, yet a valid entrance to the Christian ministry, can be explained only by such timid casuists as humbled themselves for their act in submitting to it." (Sav. Wint. i. 217, note.) Now timidity in casuistry, or Jesuitry, according to President Quincy, was one of Puritanism's most infrequent sins. The Hon. Mr. Savage will find the clue to help him out of his trouble, in the clear quotation of Mr. Felt. Such ministers of the Church of England as could prove they had a call from their people, should be considered as ministers; a bishop out of the question. Such as had nothing but an Episcopal ordination to back them,

* They did worse than that, they would not baptize Mr. Coddington's child, because, though a member of the Church of England, and one of the signers of the Arabella Letter, he had not subscribed to their *new covenant.* So they accounted a membership in the Church of England, as nothing after all.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. 17, note.

should humble themselves and repent.* This was clearly making a *mere* Episcopal ordination a sin, and a matter also of supreme indifference and contempt—in fact, a perfect immorality, if not a fearful crime. And this, the true Congregational theory makes just as necessary as ever.† So if Congregationalists do now, in spite of their system, allow Episcopal ordination, we owe no thanks to their system for this seeming condescension.

NOTE 82, p. 166.

It is no uncommon thing for Congregational ministers to become laymen, in the view of their own people. Thus I have a sermon by "The Rev. Edward Everett," late our ambassador to England—another by "The Rev. Jared Sparks," the biographer of Washington, &c., late editor of the North American Review—and a whole volume, by the "Rev. J. G. Palfrey, D. D., LL. D.," now secretary of state of Massachusetts!

These things look strange—*outrè*—to a Churchman; but they are all in keeping with the strictest Congregationalism; for, singular as it may seem, the Unitarians, as *mere* Congregationalists, are stricter than the Calvinists.

NOTE 83, p. 172.

Higginson's action as a layman is an abundant denial to Dr. Allen's assertion, p. 225 of his Dictionary, that T. Carter's case is the only undoubted one of lay ordination. Dr. A. forgets the principle on which

* It was a sad thing with the Puritans, that the Presbyterians did not always bewail and renounce their Episcopal ordinations. "A man may come into 40 places, where they are *preaching* and praying even upon days of *humiliation*, and yet never hear them *bewaile* (among multitudes of other sinnes they confesse) this particular evill of their Antichristian ordination."—Bartlet's Congregational Way, p. 120, and its own italics.—Compare Ball's Answer, p. 125, to Canne, the successor of the Mr. Lathrop mentioned in Note 80.

People have *now* not the slightest idea of the excessive scrupulosity of the Puritans, about a right to administer sacraments. It was questioned even, whether the *teacher* of a congregation could baptize; many supposing the *pastor* only competent to do it.—Cotton's Way of the Churches, edit. 1645, p. 67.—Moreover, Archbishop Whitgift said that not Puritans only, but Continental Protestants generally, would not acknowledge Episcopal ordination in his day, but insisted upon re-ordination.—See Brett on Tradition, Pt. i. p. 49. London, 1718.

How, with what semblance of propriety, can *they* complain of Episcopalians, whose forefathers were thus hostile to our ministry as an utter nullity, or what is worse, a most grievous sin?

† It was no new thing to cast contempt on Episcopal ordination, in the days of early New England history. It began even in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.—Soame's Elizabeth, p. 255. Compare Nichols' Def. of the Church of England, p. 50. —Bingham's Works, ix. 239.

that ordination was performed, viz., on that of the entire competency of the brethren to do such an act, and that Congregational ministers were present who made no objection. He forgets himself too, for, on p. 464, he says Mr. Hooker also had lay ordination. He forgets the ordination of Mr. Higginson's son in 1660, when Major Hathorne and two other brethren (they kept the canon of the Council of Nice in having *three* ordainers) laid on hands, and "the messengers of the churches," some beyond a doubt ministers, offered no scruple at *their* exclusion, as a lay brother afterwards did at *his*. (See Hutchinson's Hist. i. 374, 375; and Quincy's Harv. Univ. i. 489.) He forgets Dr. Belknap's defence of Dr. Freeman's ordination by the laymen of King's Chapel, *on the score of principle*. (See Greenwood's K. Chapel, p. 195.) He forgets, too, such cases as Trumbull gives in his Connecticut, i. 286; where the brethren ordain in spite of the ministers, and in contempt of their prerogative. Nevertheless, the zeal of Dr. Allen to gloss this matter over, shows us where another of Congregationalism's sensitive spots and weak points may be known to lie.

NOTE 84, p. 181.

"Other principles and opinions." I am taught by experience to weigh the *words* of a Puritan author, as I would those of a Jesuit. Hubbard died, as I state, in 1704; and was born in 1621. He could not be unacquainted with so notorious a book* as Edward Johnson's "Wonderworking Providence," published in 1654. Yet in that book, Churchmen are stigmatized as one in a sevenfold class of "sectaries," with whom the Puritans are warned "never to make league;" and indeed warned never to tolerate, but to "lay out" their "coin for powder, bullets, match, arms of all sorts," to keep such pestilent heretics away. (Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. ii. 58, 59.)

And now, forsooth, Hubbard knows no one among the Puritans, who did not always regard the Church of England with filial affection.

But the end of my climax is yet to come. Johnson tries the same game, and would fain undo his own words. He tries to meet the accusation that the Puritans were persecutors. He denies the charge. He says they never persecuted heretics; they only "endeavored to expel all such beasts of prey." (Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. iv. 22.) Thank you, Captain Johnson.† Then England never persecuted the Puritans, she

* "Of great value," says Allen in his Dict. p. 496.

† Johnson figured among the Puritan militia. He was one of the forty who arrested and dragged poor Gorton to Boston. Allen's Dict. p. 496.

only endeavored to drive them away—or, at any rate, to keep them from eating herself up.

This is *Puritan* logic; for we have seen specimens of the same in Mr. Bancroft and Dr. Hawes. But it is less creditable than Cromwell's, who *once*, at least, spent his force on *things* and not on *persons*. "Upon the surrender of a town in Ireland, the popish governor insisted upon an article for liberty of conscience. Cromwell said, 'He meddled with no man's conscience; but if by liberty of conscience the governor meant the liberty of the mass, he had express orders from the Parliament of England against admitting any such liberty at all.'" One can smile at Cromwell's logic, for it has real ingenuity; and as Swift admits, from whom I quote it, genuine force. The other is mere Jesuitical evasion. (See Dean Swift's Thoughts on Religion, near the end. Or, Works, xiv. 160.)

NOTE 85, p. 183.

The Browns are perpetuated by an inscription on a handsome marble tablet in St. Peter's church, Salem, Mass., of which the following is a copy.

"In memory of John and Samuel Brown, members of the Massachusetts Company, A. D. 1628; the former of the first Court of Assistants, and both members of the first council; to whose intrepidity in the cause of religious freedom, this, the first Episcopal Society gathered in New England, under God owed its establishment, in the year of our Lord 1629: and in memory of Philip English, who, in the year 1733, presented the land on which this edifice is erected; this tablet is inscribed in the year 1833, as a grateful memorial of their devotion to the cause of Christianity, and to the ritual of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

NOTE 86, p. 190.

The writer is clear enough that Puritanism would not allow a man to be a freeholder, or a voter, unless he belonged to the Puritan church establishment. "Notwithstanding," says a writer of the known reputation of the Hon. Mr. Everett, "we are indebted to them [the Puritans] for two great principles"—one of which is "the separation of church and state." (Everett's Orations, p. 225. And so Bancroft, i. 348.)

Why, as I have elsewhere shown, Episcopal Virginia began with our present democratical boast—universal suffrage—while church and state were not entirely severed in Massachusetts till 1834! Is it strange, is it at all strange, if (to let Mr. Bancroft pass,) a writer of Gov. Everett's wide-spread reputation can either make such mistakes, or perpetuate

them, that thousands of humbler minds should be utterly deceived about the genuine character of Puritan history?

I may be thought presumptuous, in impeaching such a name as Mr. Everett's. I take shelter, therefore, behind a greater. Justice Story* distinctly says, that "the fundamental *error* of our ancestors, an error which began with the very settlement of the colony, was a doctrine which has since been happily exploded; I mean the necessity of a union between church and state. To this they clung as the ark of their safety.' (Story's Miscell. p. 66.) And is it from such men that we learn to *separate* church and state—nay, as Bancroft hardily represents it, to separate them *entirely?* Why one could as soon endorse the sophomore's syllogism, "Moses was the meekest man; but Jonah lay in the whale's belly; therefore David killed Goliah."

NOTE 87, p. 197.

Laud's severity is of course a hackneyed topic. Yet Archbp. Abbot, who, as Rapin says, (ii. 179,) "Was even suspected and accused of being a Puritan," was severer than he was!!

Laud was not a man to deal in generalities and slang, like his accusers; so when charged with severity, he went to the Records of the High-Commission Court to ascertain the *facts.* Archbp. Abbot was archbishop, he says, twenty-one years:† he himself, *before* his commitment to the tower, was archbishop seven years. Yet, he says, he found in the records, that *three* more censures, deprivations, &c., were inflicted in *every* seven of Archbp. Abbot's term of twenty-one years, than in his own term of seven simply. So *all* his official life, (and the scrutiny is a fair specimen of Laud's accuracy,) Archbp. Abbot, the Puritan, was severer than Archbp. Laud, the high-churchman!! (See Laud's Troubles, p. 164.)

Still, Archbp. Abbot was highly popular with the Puritanical party. And now, what does all this show, but that a man might *act* as a high-churchman, a persecutor, or almost any body, so long as he would secretly countenance Puritan orthodoxy? But this is just what a Jesuit would allow. And so here is another of the many, many points of resemblance, between the Puritan-Protestant and the Puritan-Papist.

* Neal's New England, too, shows that even the system of tithes was resorted to, and actually argued against the Quakers! See also Note 8; and Blagden's admission which produced it. Neal's N. E. ii. 367.

† The Ap. was an archbishop for 23 years; yet in consequence of his accidentally killing a man, when hunting, his faculties were for a while suspended. It is not surprising that he became an enemy to field-sports.

NOTE 88, p. 199.

Hubbard stretches *verbal* truth to the utmost, or tells a downright untruth, when he says no authority but the king's was ever recognized in Massachusetts, during Cromwell's usurpation!* (N. Eng. pp. 575, 576. Compare Hutchinson's Coll. p. 326.) His language is Jesuitical, and he means, probably, that Massachusetts *de jure* never recognized any thing but her own charter, which was given by royal authority.† But under such a cover to attack the disloyalty of her sister colonies, is, I will not say to be wanting in courtesy, it is to be wanting in honesty. For *de facto* Massachusetts (see Note 72,) could pay heed enough to Cromwell's commands—nay, she could be his pander, to sell his Scotch enemies into slavery "for six, seven, or eight years." (Hutchinson's Collect. p. 235.)‡ And yet I have known this treatment of the Scotch extolled as a mercy! It is so extolled by Master Cotton, on the very page quoted; because the Scotch whom Cromwell shipped over to New England after the battle of Dunbar, were not sold into "perpetuall servitude." Oh, let it be noted as an example, that Puritanism, in its tender mercy, sells *white* prisoners into six, seven, or eight years' slavery—poor Indians, whom its main chartered duty it was to convert to Christianity, it sells for life!§

NOTE 89, p. 206.

This idea is not a conjuration of fancy. Boston used to be a noisy place for carts, &c., if it is not still. In 1749, (see Prov. Laws, folio, p.

* No authority but the king's! Why they proclaimed a fast to preserve Cromwell from "ranters, Quakers, and plotters;" and that the Lord might help him against Antichrist: that is, I suppose, against prelacy.—Felt's Salem, pp. 192, 193.

† "All agreed," says Winthrop, when the nature of their constitution was debated, "that our charter was the foundation of our government." But Dr. Bentley says they disregarded the patent.—M. P. Coll. 1st ser. viii. 2.—Sav. Wint. ii. 279.

‡ Doubtless they got them cheap enough. Cromwell sold prisoners for *twelve pence* a head.—Walker's Hist. Independency, Pt. i. 95. Compare p. 144; also, Pt. ii. 62, and Pt. iii. 26.—Also Dugdale's Short View, p. 577.

§ Hubbard's testimony is curious enough, at the best; and at one moment since writing this note I was ready to condemn him for downright falsehood, when I found Chalmers, in his Revolt of the Colonies, saying that Massachusetts doomed to death any one, who took up arms for the King against the Parliament. (Revolt, i. 86.) But on p. 91, he says Massachusetts never formally acknowledged Cromwell after all—only she asked favors of him, and dodged his claims. So upon the whole, as this is quite characteristic, I must let Master Hubbard go, and refer to Note 72.—Mr. Savage's note (Wint. ii. 247,) can be compared with this, and also p. 300, same volume, which shows that no legal instruments were, in early days, allowed to run in the king's name. Also, p. 100, to show how the oath of allegiance was rejected. And they, all the while, truly loyal!

63,) a law had actually to be passed, to keep carts, &c., from disturbing the Legislature.

NOTE 90, p. 206.

Snow, in his history of Boston, alludes to the principle on which prayer at funerals had been abstained from, viz., "lest it might in time introduce the customs of the English Church." (p. 92.) Upon a similar principle, Calvin forbade it in his society at Geneva, (The Phœnix, ii. 267;) and Knox in the Kirk of Scotland. (Knox's Liturgy. Cumming's edit. p. 105.) The Puritans, in the Directory of the days of the Commonwealth, did the same; (Neal, iii. 170, and v. 344;) and I am sorry to say, this is a fault from which even the Huguenots were not free. (Quick's Synodicon, i. p. xliv. Compare, however, Bingham's explanation of this.—Wks. ix. 206.)

Thus it is, that an effort to avoid superstition sometimes begets irreverence. Surely the proper way to cure a wrong praying over the dead, or for the dead, cannot be to pray not at all.* Yet we see about all Protestants, save those of the Church of England, fell into this mistake, and have had to retrace their steps.

There is another error about an occasional religious ceremony, into which, so far as I know, the Puritans alone fell. This was to allow none but magistrates to solemnize marriages. (See Snow's Boston as before, p. 192.) At the instance of their first Episcopal governor, this was corrected; but the result of the *old* practice has been the low and mischievous doctrine, that marriage is but a civil contract merely. Hence the ease with which divorces are granted, in Connecticut and elsewhere. (Remarks on a Rev. of Inchiquin's Letters, pp. 128, 129.) For modern views of the mere worldly, secular character of marriage, we have then to thank the Puritans! And this is the way to cure the superstition of Papists, who call matrimony a sacrament, and of Prelatists, who marry by a priest and with a ring!!

NOTE 91, p. 209.

It is not true, however, that the Baptists were entirely free from burdens, till after the American Revolution—nor then, indeed. (See Benedict's Baptists, i. 381, and further onward in the same vol. Also vol. ii. 482–86.)

* The way, however, to avoid superstition about fish-eating was different. Dun-fish is excellent, so it would not answer to give it up. Therefore the Puritan way of eating fish is, to eat it Saturday instead of Friday. There are no better dun-fish in the world, than in the land of the Puritans. This I *know*.

While upon this subject, I cannot forbear mentioning a most curious fact. It is well known that the Revolution grew out of the resistance of the Colonies to their taxation by England. The Puritans should have been the last to repudiate such taxation; for *they hesitated not to tax English property*, whenever they could, by any pretence, lay their hands on it. Mr. Felt admits, that so early as 1639, "they ordered persons here, and through the Colony, who owned estates in England, to be taxed for them." (Felt's Salem, p. 121.)

And these are the people who raised such a hue and cry against taxation without representation!* Were these persons who owned estates in England allowed to vote in Puritan councils? Never, unless they owned the Puritan covenant. Without that qualification, they could not be so much as freemen.† Yet without representation, without a title to so much as the elective franchise, they might be taxed for estates situated under another government, 3000 miles away, and taxed over again under that government, for its legitimate support. And this in the land of liberty, and by the fiat of the refugees of persecution! This by men, to whom the taxation of England, (looked upon by England as but an equivalent for charter privileges,) was a usurpation, the most monstrous the heavens ever saw!

NOTE 92, p. 212.

Myself doubtless will be esteemed most prejudiced. I therefore quote the Hon. Mr. Savage. "Put not your faith in Mather," he says. (Sav. Wint. ii. 331, note.) Moreover, he adds, this saying will become an axiom.‡

President Quincy, in his Hist. Harv. Univ., vol. i. pp. 91, 156, shows how the records of the College could be tampered with, and *false facts* made out to suit a purpose. Such things abundantly warrant the low faith I sometimes put in Puritan authorities, and the suspicions I have thrown upon them. If a *public* address of Puritan ministers could, as Quincy (i. 156) most satisfactorily shows, tell a palpable fib; then Puri-

* It must be remembered, that I apply this language to the Puritans only. I agree to the doctrine of our forefathers, that taxation and representation should go together, and I believe in their complaints of grievances. But I see not how the *Puritans* could complain of England's conduct, when they had already set her the example.

† And this, as usual, is an imitation of Popery. The theory of Popery is, that government is founded in grace, and so none but the *gracious* must have a share in it. Massachusetts was once taught this sharp lesson in her own legislature.—See Leland's Speech. Benedict's Baptists, ii. 485.

‡ Compare Edwards' Mss. history, quoted in Benedict's Baptists, i. 469.

tan ecclesiastical documents are to be watched, as the "European Settlements" said the Pilgrims were in Holland. The conclusion is unavoidable; for confidence (as many seem not to be aware) is not, and cannot be, a voluntary thing.

NOTE 93, p. 224.

Gov. Andross, as we see, has been bitterly censured for this act. But he did first, what *they* said they did with the Quakers—tried to coax, and found it ineffectual. Moreover, at the worst, he did but exercise the prerogative awarded him by Thomas, "the judicious Hooker" of New England. "The supreme magistrate hath liberty and power, both to inquire and judge of professions and religions, which is true and ought to be maintained, which is false and ought to be rejected." (Survey of Church Discipline, Pt. iv. p. 57.) Such *discipline* as this Puritan Solomon sanctions, would have allowed Andross to shut up the Old South altogether, except for his own use.

It is hard for me to believe the severe comments of the Puritans on Andross, for his administration in Massachusetts.* Dr. Allen in his Dictionary, (art. Andross,) who is caustic in his remarks on him, admits that, previously, as Governor of New-York, and afterwards, as Governor of Virginia, he behaved very well. Burk says he had "a sound judgment and a liberal policy," and was "of a conciliating deportment and of great generosity." (Burk's Va. ii. 316.) Even Allen concedes that he *began* fairly in Massachusetts. And, now, what was one of his foremost and heaviest offences? Why, that the Charter being vacated, their legal title to lands was gone, and they must have a new one. And what if he so held? Well might I say, imitating Mr. Greenwood, 'What a retribution! Think of the days of Roger Williams!' Was it not their very own, darling doctrine against poor Roger and the Indians, that the royal charter gave them a title to Massachusetts soil? did they not maintain this doctrine, to the sad detriment of both? and if the doctrine were true, did not all the Charter gave, depart with it when it died? and what then did Andross do, but use their own position against themselves?

I should be loath to say, that the sufferings of the Puritans under Andross were Heaven's vindication of Williams and the Aborigines; but if I had a Puritan tact at interpreting and applying Scripture, I should do so without hesitation. And at any rate, if the chief sin of Andross

* Mr. Washburn, in his Judicial History, (p. 94, etc.) condemns Andross severely as a matter of course. Yet, on p. 104, he admits that he improved the *forms* of justice. He forgets that one of the *old* forms, by his own stricture, (p. 55,) was to pay "little regard to the ordinary rules of evidence."

were, as stated, and if the materials he had to operate upon were as cross-grained, as I am sure they were, I should be rather disposed to judge his character by the testimony of New-York and Virginia, than by that of Puritanical Massachusetts.

NOTE 94, p. 244.

I have hinted that something might be expected from me, to show that the Puritans, "for all their poverties," as Capt. Smith says, were quite as much given to the fashions of the world, as some of far humbler pretensions than they made—such pretensions, *e. g.*, as John Higginson's, about being a member of the purest among pure churches.

I am told that some who have examined the *exuviæ Puritanicæ*, at the museum of the Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Mass., have looked on, mute with wonder, to find the Puritans guilty of so much external splendor. I should expect to find such splendor there; for so early as 1634, according to Mr. Felt, their devotion to "new and immodest fashions" became intolerable, and a subject for legislation. (Felt's Salem, pp. 70, 71.) Accordingly, all the canonical thunder which could be mustered was discharged "at the ordinary, [mark, reader, it was *every-day* fashions which were to be laid aside—on Sunday, I beg pardon, on the Sabbath, I suppose they could be worn still,] the *ordinary* wearing of silver, gold, and silk laces, girdles, hat-bands, &c. Also, that no person, either man or woman, [alas, the men were in the scrape—the ladies are not *always* the "weaker vessels," at least on Puritan soil,] shall make, or buy, any slashed clothes, other than one slash in each sleeve, and another in the back. Also, all cut works, embroidered or needle-worked caps, bands, and rayles." [A rayl, or rail, old N. Bailey says, is a sort of short cloak worn by women: perhaps what we now call "cardinals."] "Also, all gold or silver girdles, hat-bands, belts, ruffs, beaver hats, are prohibited to be bought and worn." Also, another discharge is made against "immoderate great sleeves, slash apparel, immoderate great rayles, long wings, &c."

And now, would one believe that these are the habits of people, but yesterday feeding on parched corn and clams? Why Broadway itself, with all its gay and glittering stores, would hardly furnish out their wardrobe! And they are so "immoderate," their "wings" are so insufferably "long," that even legislative violence has to pluck their plumes! But I doubt, I gravely doubt, after all, whether the Legislature with its would-be omnipotence did much.* Let us see what Boston was, near the close of

* They tried hard another time, in 1651, and in this way. "They declare, that 'intolerable excesse and bravery hath crept in upon us, and especially among people

this same auspicious century, and when my testifier assures me it enjoyed "the free liberty of the [Puritanic] Gospel." "All sorts," I must beg my reader to note the words, "*All sorts* of calicoes, aligers, remwalls, muslin, silks for clothing and linings; [even *linings*, it seems, must be silk too;] *all sorts* of drugs proper for the apothecaries, and *all sorts* of spice, are vendible with us." (Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d ser. vii. 203, 209.) Also, "For musk, bezoar, pearl, and diamond, I believe some of them may sell well."

These are the cool, calculating answers of a Massachusetts merchant to his distant brother, who wanted to know how to invest his money for a Boston cargo. So it seems a Puritan Legislature could no more keep out fashion than it could keep out heresy; and that their degenerate constituents, (of course church-members,) were seeking to perfume themselves with musk, and shine in the diamonds of Golconda.

I have, on another occasion, (Note 90,) shown that *no prayers* were allowed at Puritanic funerals, "lest it might in time introduce the customs of the English Church." It is proper for me, in this note, to show what *was* allowed. I quote Mr. Felt, for so low a date as 1685. "Voted, that some persons be appointed to look to the burning of the wine and heating of the cider, against the time appointed for the funeral. The expense of the occasion was £17 19*s.*, *exclusive* of clothing for the minister's family. [This at even a *minister's* funeral, be it remembered!]* Among the articles provided were thirty-two gallons of wine, and a larger quantity of cider, with one hundred and four pounds of sugar, [very dear in

of mean condition; and their utter detestation and dislike, that men of mean conditions and callings should take upon them the garb of gentlemen, by wearing gold or silver lace, or buttons, or points at their knees, to walk in great boots, or women of the same ranke, to wear silk or tiffany hoods or scarfs: *which, though allowable to persons of greater estates*, or *more liberal education, they judge it intolerable in persons of such like condition.*' " They then go on to enact, that if worth two hundred pounds, or a magistrate, parson, &c., a man might be a Puritan dandy; or his wife and daughters, Puritan dandizettes. (See Coffin's Newburyport, p. 55, and Holmes's Annals, i. 579; though Holmes, *ut modo*, leaves out the worst parts.)

What have New Englanders more complained of, at the present day, than the supposed intention of the democrats, to excite *a hatred of the poor against the rich*? We now see, where this hatred was first taught systematically to Americans. A more detestable law than the above, or one better calculated to array the humbler classes of society against the richer, cannot be found in the annals of despotism. Yet such a law Puritans sanction, in the height of their glory; for the next year they had a mint! Dr. Holmes is mistaken, in supposing the law from Stow's Chronicle, an example for this. That did not, with legislative solemnity, teach the poor to hate the wealthy: it only pruned dandyism at large. It did not teach, either, "an utter detestation and dislike" of those, who, unfortunately were not worth "the true and indifferent sum of two hundred pounds."

* In 1739, Mr. Felt says, the expenses were ten times greater! So then they must have consumed 320 gallons of wine, &c.

those times,] and about four dozen gloves." (Felt's Ipswich, pp. 198, 199.)

I might go on to show, what was allowed in this way at ordinations also, but perhaps the note is too long already.

NOTE 95, p. 244.

Mention has already been made, on p. 21, of the mission of Puritan ministers to Virginia. But Virginia did not want them, and sent them away. This was a thing which President Quincy, &c., would earnestly defend, if done by *them*. See now how they viewed it. Prelatic superstitution is one of their hackneyed themes: they accounted the awful incursion of Opechancanough and his savages, as the just punishment of the irreverent Episcopal colony. It sent away Puritan ministers, who would surely have stirred up a faction, "chusing rather," so testifies one of the purest of pure church-members, "the fellowship of their drunken companions, and a priest of their own profession, who could hardly continue so long sober, as till he could read them the reliques of man's invention in a common prayer book." (Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d ser., viii. 30, 31.)

But it is wrong, very wrong, say my Puritan critics, to revive such bitter things—better cover them with the mantle of oblivion. Not to say that poor Ap. Laud never yet received the ravellings of that mantle from their hands, I have merely to add, this is an old argument, and has had an old reply. As I have revived one of the "bitter things," I will revive the answer too, and let the matter go.

"You desire," say the Rhode Islanders of Providence, in 1722, to an association of Puritan ministers of Massachusetts, of *all* of them perhaps, "that all former injuries done by you to us, may be buried in oblivion. We say, far be it from us to avenge ourselves, or to deal to you as you have dealt to us, but rather to say with our Lord, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!* But if you mean that we should not speak of former actions, done hurtfully to any man's person, we say God never called for that, nor suffered to be so done; as witness Cain, Joab, and Judas, which are upon record to deter other men from doing the like." (Benedict's Baptists, i. 471.)

NOTE 96, p. 250.

The Winthrops were a suspected race. There was a book of Common Prayer in the library of one of them, and it was eaten by mice; though bound up with some other books, which were left untouched. (Sav. Wint., ii. 20.) This was a formidable disaster, and Gov. Winthrop is obliged to put it into his journal. No doubt it was a sad thing, to own

such a doleful volume, and so he must record Heaven's judgment against it, to save his own reputation. But *we* may content ourselves with Mr. Savage's better than German criticism: "If the cat had been in Winthrop's library, she might have prevented the stigma on the common prayer."

NOTE 97, p. 255.

I have made no search for the presents given to Endicott. While looking for other things, I have accidentally noticed, that Massachusetts gave him the amount of a splendid plantation, more than 1300 acres of land—sold him another of 1000 acres, for some eighteen pence an acre —pensioned his widow, and endowed his son. This, surely, among a people who counted *pennies*, evinced a very rich estimation of him. (See Felt's Salem; pp. 57, 120, 179, 195, 206, 211, 239.)

NOTE 98, p, 258.

This boring the tongue with a red-hot iron, whether actually inflicted by Massachusetts or not, was certainly a favorite idea of hers. As late as 1697, in the act against Socinianism, and denial of the full canon of Scripture, it is decreed as one of the punishments. Had it been decreed a century later, Mr. Bancroft might have been bored, most effectually, by his new foster-children, the Calvinists. (See foot note in Letter XII, p. 245, noticing his alterations of his first edition.)

There is a peculiarity in the orthography of the old act. (See Acts and Laws of Mass. 1726, p. 88.) It says "boaring thorow the tongue;" which I supposed was intended to mean, what we should by "through the tongue." But on p. 137, for example, of the *same* volume, I twice find "through" spelt as we now spell it. I am constrained, therefore, to confess with a shudder, that it seems designed to amount to "thorough," or "thoroughly."

NOTE 99, p. 259.

There were but four actually put to death. But what was the welcome of Chalkley, the Quaker, when he ventured to travel in New England as late as 1693? "Oh what a pity that all your society were not hanged with the other four." (Gough's Quakers, i. 494.) The case is too desperate even for Mr. Bacon, though Mr. Bancroft endeavors to give it a serene look. He confesses that Connecticut, like Massachusetts, indulged in "branding, whipping, and fining;" and then enforces himself and adds, "I doubt not that if these penalties had not kept their coasts clear from such invaders, they would have proceeded to hanging." (Hist.

Discourses, p. 99.) Who can be surprised, therefore, at the sharp language of the authors of the Europ. Settlements: "This people, who in England could not bear being chastised with rods, had no sooner got free from their fetters, than they scourged their fellow-refugees with scorpions." (E. Sett. ii. 146.) But, let us remember, the book just quoted is one at which Mr. Young flouts, for what he calls its contemptible sneers. (Chronicles, p. 48, notes.) A book of facts laughs at such pop-gun artillery.

NOTE 100, p. 263.

The Propagation Society was founded in 1700, (See Humphrey's Hist. Account,) while Missionary Societies which have been founded since 1800, have been looked upon as novelties in religious history, and have received applause without bounds. But they happen to be non-Episcopal.

Episcopalians have probably one of the oldest charitable societies in North America; but for all that, they have been supposed to be neglectful of alms-giving, because they did not attend to it in the society-fashion, and publish lists of their benefactions. Yet the Episcopal Charitable Society of Boston dates from 1724. (See Rev. Dr. Boyle's Hist. Memoir, 1840.) And what is very curious, a Puritan governor of Massachusetts, when it wanted a Charter *after* the Revolution, objected to giving one, because an annual meeting was named for "Easter Tuesday." He had no objection to their meeting on any day of the year they pleased, but they must not call their days by such Popish or heathenish names. I have this anecdote from an aged friend, living at the time upon the spot. Thus we see how Puritanism, even among the most intelligent, waged war upon her, for the smallest minutiæ, and to the very last.

NOTE 101, p. 264. (Last line but one of the foot notes.)

Bogue and Bennett, in their History of Dissenters, seemed to look upon King William as founding this Society with mere sectarian motives. (Diss. ii. 334.) It is well known that one of the nicknames given the Society was, "The Society for propagating Episcopacy in foreign parts." But the society sent missionaries here, at the *urgent request* of the people: it was any thing but obtrusive. (Humphrey's Account, pp. 44, 45.) Yet so it is. In the first place, Episcopalians are said to be mere formalists, more dead than alive, who have no religion themselves, and care not to see any in others. And when they *do* send missionaries —oh, you are intrusive busybodies, who want to build yourselves up, and pull Congregationalists down. Thus it was of old: "We have piped unto you, but ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented."

NOTE 102, p. 266.

The number which perished on the ocean, or by disease, amid their attempts to obtain Holy Orders, is stated by a writer in the Gentleman's Magazine, as a very large proportion. The volume I cannot now refer to; but perhaps the index to the volumes between 1760 and 1770 will enable a curious inquirer to satisfy himself.

NOTE 103, p. 267.

The following is the communication to which allusion is here made. It may be found in the Churchman for Sept. 13, 1834.

"Queen Anne died in August, 1714. She was a fast friend to the Propagation Society, and always ready to sustain and carry out its benevolent plans. Toward the close of her reign, the patrons of the society became persuaded, as well from considerations of high expediency, as from a true zeal for the primitive organization of the Church, that the ecclesiastical establishments in the colonies should be perfected by the appointment of colonial bishops. A plan, some details of which may be found in Greenwood's Hist. of King's Chapel, Boston, pp. 78–82, was drawn up about 1714, and wanted but the ready co-operation of the Queen to become a reality. According to this plan, there were to be four bishops, with salaries from £1000 to £1500; two for the West Indies, and two for the Continent. Death frustrated the intentions of her Majesty, and blighted the hopes of many hearty advocates for Episcopacy.

"But the plan was not forgotten. It was not likely it would be. Episcopacy was growing fast in the Colonies, and even in 1714, says Mr. Greenwood, the Propagation Society, in the prosecution of their scheme for colonial bishops, 'were warmly seconded by the congregation of the Chapel.' Efforts were accordingly repeated in the reign of George I., which might have resulted favorably, had not the king been a German, and been more solicitous about Hanover than America. However, notwithstanding Germany occupied the place next home in his Majesty's regard, the friends of the Colonies, (at the time to which I wish more particularly to allude, the winter of 1724–5,) were considerably cheered. The mission of a bishop to New England became a topic of frequent mention.

"Did the Puritan Independents hear nothing of this? That is not at all probable. Would they hear it quietly? That is as little probable. Well, then, what did they do? Why it had been customary for them to have a convention of their ministers yearly, as they have in Boston to this day. It was proposed in a Memorial to the Legislature, by one who was no bad shot at a guess, (Cotton Mather, of Magnalian memory,)

to call in 1724 *a much larger convention than usual,* that they might ascertain, 'What are the miscarriages whereof we have reason to think the judgments of Heaven upon us call us to be more generally sensible, and what may be the most *evangelical and effectual expedients* to put a stop unto those or the like miscarriages.' (Hutchinson's Mass., 3d edit. ii. 292, note.)

"What was the real object on which the Herculean energies of this Synod were to work? The manufacture of an ecclesiastical platform? They had one already: the Confession of 1680. To tinker on the old one? They were not infested with the creed-hating mania, which has spread so contagiously in our day. No: Hutchinson himself testifies to the affection of many for the old platform, and even offers this as a plausible extenuation of the designs for a synod. What then was the *nodus* of this imposing scheme? Some precious *morceaux* of the ecclesiastical history of Massachusetts, preserved in the letters of Dr. Cutler, Mr. John Checkley, and extracts from newspapers, and which may be found in the fourth volume of Nichols's Literary Illustrations, p. 268, et. seq., can I think give it to us. From these, and from Gov. Dummer's letter of 1st Sept., 1725, (for which see Hutch. Hist. ii. 292,) the desired solution can be made out. (Compare Douglass's Summary, i. 440, No. 6.—Tudor's Otis, pp. 499, 500.)

"It seems that the proposed Synod attracted the attention of Episcopalians, who were hoping, with encouragement, for the appearance of a bishop. This could hardly have been, had they not apprehended from it all possible interference with their plans for the establishment of an American Episcopate; and how much this *possibility* might have included, it is not very hard to conjecture, when we know that Mather was a presiding genius in the councils of Congregationalism. Well knowing, or justly fearing the effects of the Synod, it was of course a primary object with the Churchmen of Boston, to obtain some authentic document in relation to it, and see (so far as might be) what was proposed for its consideration. It is not a little remarkable that the memorial of Mather, in the name of his associates, had hitherto been kept carefully out of sight. News, indeed, of the desire for a Synod had, somehow or other (*not officially*) reached England; and so severe a rebuke* had

* This rebuke was perfectly justifiable, according to the Church Polity of the Puritan Hooker. "And the same power he [the supreme magistrate] hath, to confine his own people from such general assemblings, within his own precincts."—Hooker's survey of the Summe of Ch. Discipline, Pt. iv. p. 58.—In this point, as might be expected, Hooker agrees with the Pope: the Puritan-Protestant and the Puritan-Papist assimilating as usual.—See Ward's Law of Nations, ii. 103, 104.

come back, that the curiosity of Episcopalians in Boston was still more whetted, to see what treason there might be in the schemes of the enemy. They wanted to read the memorial praying for a Synod; or rather one good honest member of the House of Representatives, who heard the rebuke alluded to, wanted to do so, (whether Churchman or not, it is not said, but the presumption is strong he was one,) and he accordingly went to the Secretary of State, and procured a copy of it. This copy he presented to Checkley, who transcribed it, and it was soon in many hands.

"This is a very simple matter, truly: going to the archives of the State to procure the copy of a document, which had never been acted on in secret conclave—never been pronounced a matter of privacy, and never intrusted to the Secretary with prohibitions as to loaning it to unworthy eyes. But the consequences were not quite so simple. The poor wight who went to the Secretary, soon finds a *mittimus* at his heels—is not even permitted to see this *mittimus*—is accused of stealing the memorial—is denied counsel—is refused a hearing at the bar of the House of which he is a blameless member—and finally is ignominiously expelled that House, with the brand of a liar and peace-disturber upon his hitherto unsullied name. Nay, the list of grievances is not ended here. The unfortunate Secretary, who thought he was selling a piece of paper, and not double-battled gunpowder, when he delivered the copy of the memorial and put his ten shillings in his fob, finds his house about his ears, and himself Secretary no more, with an expedition bordering on the marvellous.

"Much more might be said concerning this once famous memorial—the efforts to keep it away from all who did not understand, what Papists call "*the discipline of the secret*"—and the punishment of those who made too free with its cabalistic words. But enough has been said, if it induces any to think of and look into the past of our Church History, with a little of that curiosity and interest they so well deserve and will so richly reward. Much has been said, much is still said, about the tyranny of Bishops and the intolerance of Churchmen. I would submissively take and patiently bear all just reproach; but would also bid our censurers beware, ere they assail *our* escutcheon, to look well to their own. There may be *other* little spots in the track of their story; which, like the one just alluded to, will hardly be as refreshing if brought to view, as an oasis to a traveller in the desert."

This, with a few verbal alterations, was written in Sept. 1834, and when I had not the remotest expectation that it would be followed by a series of letters in the year following, and a book in 1845.

NOTE 104, p. 269.

Much might be said here about Whitfield, whom the Puritans gladly employed, thinking he would preach down the Church. (See Chandler's Johnson, pp. 65, 66.) But he lighted so much wildfire among themselves, that many regretted they had not let him alone. I find even Mr. Bacon recording some of the disasters which occurred about 1740, the year when Whitfield made his first appearance in New England. See his Hist. Discourses, pp. 245, 252. Dr. Charles Chauncey, in his "Seasonable Thoughts," published at Boston in 1743, tells us a longer and sadder story; and, among other things, informs us that Connecticut actually passed a law restraining ministers "from preaching in other men's parishes, without their and their church's consent, and wholly prohibiting the exhortations of illiterate laymen," (Seas. Thoughts, p. 41.) Dr. Cutler, Rector of Christ Church, Boston, wrote thus about Dr. Chauncey's book and the times, to Dr. Zachary Grey, one of the castigators of Neal. "The author, Dr. Chauncey, told me that he could have printed more flagrant accounts, if his intelligencers would have allowed him. This has turned to the growth of the Church in many places, and its reputation universally." (Nichols's Lit. Illustrations, iv. 304.) Whitfield's wildfire is not the first, nor the last, of such ecclesiastical prairie-burnings of Congregationalism, which have driven many into the fold of the mother their fathers loved so "dearly." Cannot many of our elderly clergy in New England testify to a verification of Dr. Cutler's experience in their own parishes?

Besides scenes such as Whitfield ushered in, and their results to the Church, there are multitudes of such cases as the Rev. Thomas Davies records, who was a missionary at Great Barrington, in Mass., in the year 1764. A notice of his sermon, on Christmas, 1764, and a note from himself may be found in the Churchman for March 17, 1835. Here was a case, where Churchmen were harassed with taxes, rates, &c. &c., and by every other possible means, to prevent their getting a foothold in Great Barrington. The case is but a parallel to many more; and is merely alluded to for an example, and to show how the bitter spirit of the Puritans travelled with them, or was sent forth as an emissary. I should not have been surprised to find Puritans at Boston, or Salem, doing all they could to vex Episcopalians. But at G. Barrington, on the western verge of Mass., and in almost another country, I should have expected more moderation. But even *there*, it seems to to have lost none of its sharpness, but kept its tenor like unadulterated vinegar.

NOTE 105, p. 270.

Such tattlers as Whitfield, who pretended to let two congregational ministers know half of a scheme to oppress America in 1764, and enjoined secrecy upon them with such *peculiar* earnestness, that one of them soon after committed the secret to a public sermon, delivered before a clerical convention,—such tattlers and fire-kindlers, rather than Episcopacy, brought on the Revolution.

It is a principle of Episcopacy, never to force a bishop's ordination or mission. "A bishop, by the rules of the Holy Ghost, must be thoroughly examined and peaceably ordained, by such as shall impose hands on him; and not peremptorily intruded, or imposed, by any earthly power." (Bilson's Ch. Gov., new ed., p. 476.) The British Government would not have obtruded a bishop upon the Puritans, on this side of the Atlantic: they would have sent him *to*, and *for*, Episcopalians only. Dr. Chandler wrote to explain the views and wishes of Churchmen upon this subject, and to correct misrepresentations. He wrote, too, as expressing the views and feelings of Churchmen generally. (Chandler's Johnson, pp. 114, 115.) Let him, or a dozen like him, however, have done their best, one such inflammatory effort as Whitfield's—a man, too, with the unrevoked vows of the Church of England upon his soul—could have brought their best exertions to none effect. The anecdote of Whitfield alluded to, may be found in Gordon's Amer. Rev. i. 143, 144; and is one melancholy illustration, among a thousand, that the highest pretensions to piety are consistent with the dereliction of principles voluntarily assumed.* A politician may not be unfaithful to a party, without peril to his reputation; but a clergyman may show all possible nonconformity to a system, which he has freely before God and man professed, and *he* will be thought by many to know more of the religion of the heart than the man who keeps his vows. It is one of this world's mysteries. A soldier or a sailor untrue to the articles of war, is thought a traitor. A minister, whose vows are freely taken, may be untrue to the regulations of his Church, and he is pious *par excellence;* as though treason against a creed or a canon were fidelity to Christ! †

* This may seem hard, but when we know, by Whitfield's own letters, (see Christian Remembrancer, iv. 290,) that he would not so much as come to America without his bishop's permission, and then that as soon as he got here he set all church law and order at defiance, it will appear no ways excessive.

† I may be pardoned perhaps, for speaking thus upon this subject, when I show, that it is one on which a bare sense of honor can make even an Infidel truly moral. "Ought any man," says Hume himself, rebuking Puritan laxity upon this matter, "to accept of an office or benefice in an establishment, while he declines compliance with the fixed and known rules of that establishment?" (Hist. of Eng. N. Y.

NOTE 106, p. 272.

The cause of the American Revolution is candidly and exactly stated by Dr. John J. Zubly, a Presbyterian minister at Savannah, Georgia, in a sermon published by him in 1775, before the Revolution began. Zubly, according to Gordon, was the principal agent "who roused the attention of many in the province, to the alarming situation of American affairs." (Amer. Rev. ii. 75.) This is his voluntary testimony. "The question between Great Britain and America, which has already been productive of such alarming effects, is, 'Whether the Parliament of Great Britain have any power or authority to tax the Americans, without their consent?' Every *impartial* man will allow, that this is the foundation of the *whole dispute*." (Zubly's Sermon, p. 28.) *

This covers the entire debateable ground; and coming from an intelligent Presbyterian, ought to be considered as relieving Episcopacy from any responsibility in the premises.

Boucher, in his Discourses, declares that Episcopacy was little cared for in itself, but was made a stalking-horse by politicians. "It by no means follows that Episcopacy was thus opposed, from its having been thought by these transatlantic oppositionists as in any respect in itself proper to be opposed; but it served to keep the public mind in a state of ferment and effervescence; to make them jealous and suspicious of all measures not brought forward by demagogues, and, above all, to train and habituate the people to opposition." That in this way, without its being "apparent at the time," politicians *made* it a cause of political agitation, he admits. (Discourses, pp. 149, 150.) But is this strange, when Pownall, in his 4th edition of his work on the Colonies, published in 1768, talks of "the mother country and her colonies, misrepresented to and misinformed of each other?" (Pownall, p. 29.) In his sermon on the American Episcopate, delivered at St. Mary's Ch., Caroline Co., Virginia, in 1771, Boucher distinctly and solemnly declared, "All that has been or will be solicited by us, is a primitive bishop: a bishop without power of

and Boston, 1810, vol. v. p. 172.) O intolerable, that an avowed unbeliever should be teaching moral obligations to professed ministers of the Gospel! It may answer for a heathen to say, as Hippolytus in Euripides, "My tongue hath sworn: my mind is still unsworn." It may do for a Jesuit, or a Puritan, to swear with mental reservations; but against all such swearing, let every *honest* man be a Protestant indeed.

I mix up the Puritans and the Jesuits. How can I help it, when I remember the letter from the Arabella, and Pres. Quincy's testimonies to their duplicity?—Hist. Harv. Univ. i. 91, 136, 156, 351.

* Compare the New York declaration of rights in Stone's Brant, i. 35.—Otis's Botta, i. 78, 79. Bradford's Massachusetts, p. 102, etc.

any kind, excepting in what relates to the clergy." (Disc. p. 139.) And this sentiment had been just as distinctly maintained by all the Episcopalians at the north; and all Dr. Chauncey's arguments from gossip and hearsay amounted to nothing, against the explicit averments of Dr. Chandler in the name of the whole Episcopal community.

See Chandler's Johnson, pp. 114, 115, 116. Also Eddis's Letters, p. 50, from which it appears, that Episcopalians themselves at the South (though they, as he says, "greatly exceed those of all other denominations,") were made as hostile to the introduction of a bishop, as their neighbors. Surely politicians must have been very busy, to make Churchmen so unfriendly to a part of their own system. If the world had let the Church alone, all would have gone on quietly and well. To make her contend against herself, and then blame her for the contention, may be agreeable to "the spirit of the world;" and to be condemned by *such* a spirit is not very discomposing.

NOTE 107, p. 275.

Puritanism refused to bury Chillingworth's *body*, because he was an Episcopalian; but it buried his immortal *book* in behalf of Protestantism,* and that with one of its deepest anathemas. Cheynell, the Puritan minister at Chichester, where Chillingworth died in 1644, refused to bury him, but threw his book into his grave with the following anathema, and then went away and preached forthwith from the text, "Let the dead bury their dead," &c. (Luke ix. 60): "Get thee gone, thou cursed booke, which has seduced so many precious souls; get thee gone, thou corrupt, rotten booke, earth to earth and dust to dust; get thee gone into the place of rottennesse, that thou maist rot with thy author and see corruption." (See Biog. Universelle, viii. 371, and Christian Disciple for 1819, p. 343: published at Boston.)

I cannot forbear adding, that Chillingworth, one of the most earnest champions for Protestantism ever known, was brought back from Romanism mainly under the instrumentality of William Laud, so often accused of being a Papist himself. And also, to show Laud's true conscientiousness and devotion to his duties as a Churchman, that his peculiar interest in Chillingworth, personally, was owing to the fact that he was his godfather. Though Chillingworth had reached manhood, and had probably long before been confirmed, Laud could not and would not forget his spiritual

* Chillingworth, though his book is *now* considered one of the strongest bulwarks of Protestantism, died, in the opinion of Puritanism, "a desperate, apostate Papist." (Le Bas's Laud, p. 242.) If justice is at last done to his name, may we hope that the time will come, when not less justice will be done to Archbishop Laud's?

child, or let him go. The letters which passed between Laud and Chillingworth, would probably do unbounded credit to the heads and hearts of both, but they have perished. The Puritans doubtless destroyed them, when they seized Laud's papers; for he appeals to these very letters in his Defence, as in their possession, to show his instrumentality in Chillingworth's conversion. (See Laud's Troubles, pref. p. vii. and p. 227. Wood's Ath. Ox. ii. 41, 42. Gen. Biog. Dict. folio, iv. 317. Le Bas's Laud, chap. vii. or pp. 241, 242, Eng. edit.)

NOTE 108, p. 276.

Churchmen are often blamed for their uncharitableness towards their "dissenting brethren;" because, it is said, the differences which separate them by no means touch the essentials of Christianity—in fact, are mere trifles. And why, it is asked, are they excluded from our pulpits, &c., &c., for such things?

This is an old argument, and I like to give it its old answer; especially as I can do so from one of my "truly gracious" Presbyterian authors.—"If," says Mr. Edwards to the Puritan Independents, in his reply to their Manifesto, "If so be, that you differ so little from the Reformed Churches, and your brethren—Why do you not then incorporate with us? Why will you, or how can you answer it to God, for *that* to make a rent?"—And a little further on, he lays down an ecclesiastical maxim, worthy the days of the apostolic fathers: "*The smaller the difference is, the greater is the schism and separation; for the less the cause of a separation is, the greater the fault is in those that make it.*" I most earnestly and affectionately commend this sound Presbyterian doctrine to those, who, for mere matters of form, external trifles, have forsaken the communion of their "dear mother, the Church of England."* (See Edwards's Antapologia, p. 269, for the quotations. The Antapologia, it may be well enough to say, bears the date of 1644.)

NOTE 109, p. 280.

If Mr. Choules can commune with them about sentiments, ought he not to do so in sacraments? On the contrary, does he esteem their sacraments so worthless that he would rebaptize their members, and, if as consistent as his brethren of old, (see Benedict's Baptists, i. 286,) reordain their ministers? And is it not somewhat worse than "absurd," to sympathize with those who persecuted his own sect, merely because they

* Compare their awfully solemn protestation to Charles II., that they did not leave England "In rebellion or schism."—Hutchinson's Collect. p. 328.—But this was to save the old charter!

love the "apostolic succession" as little as he does? Mr. C. will not consider this personal; for he knows my unfeigned regard for him as a man. But he must not expect me, however, to view his own position with vast consideration, when he has caricatured a Churchman's as an "absurd" one.

I beg my readers to notice the reference to Benedict's history. It shows that the Baptists, when true to their own principles, must nullify all orders but their own. What indeed could be more "absurd," than to sanction Holy Orders conferred by men, who no more belonged to the Christian Church than do the remotest heathen? Baptism is the only mode of admission to the Christian Church. But immersion is the only baptism. Therefore nearly all the, so called, Christian world do not so much as belong to the Christian Church.

This is a terribly unchurching syllogism; but I see not how any consistent Baptist can reject it.

NOTE 110, p. 285.

Hakewill's Apology was written in 1627, and its character cannot be better given than in the following opinion of Warton, in his edition of Pope's Works, iv. 319. "They whom envy, malevolence, melancholy, discontent, and disappointment, have induced to think that the world is totally degenerated, and that it is daily growing worse and worse, would do well to read a sensible, but too much neglected treatise of an old divine, written 1630, Hakewill's Apology," &c.

Dugald Stuart (in his Works, vi. 446, Amer. ed.) appears to think that Hakewill was a silent imitator of Lord Bacon, and wrote as a mere philosopher. I cannot divest myself of the idea, that Hakewill's noble effort was the rather levelled against the hue and cry of universal degeneracy, raised by the Puritans as a preparation for a revolution in Church and State. For example, a mock self-disparagement was one of their notorious peculiarities. But in giving his reasons for writing he says, "We desire not to settle the praise of humility on false grounds, lest, being built upon falsehood, it lose the reward of truth."* (Apology. Lib. i. Chap. 2. Sect. 1.)

NOTE 111, p. 292.

The uninformed may suppose these singular sentiments for a Churchman. They are not aware, that the legislative government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is representative and repub-

* Hakewill was not the only philosopher of his day who labored against the follies of the Puritans. See Burton's Anat. of Melancholy, ii. 538, London, 1826.

lican, like the government of the Nation.* The bishops form our congressional senate, and an equal number of clergymen and laymen our congressional house of representatives. And (a peculiar feature) this lower house, on all important questions, resolves itself into clergy and laity, voting separately; and a majority of *each* order is then necessary (i. e. a double majority) to carry any measure.

So bishops, clergy, and laity, have all *equal* rights; and an equal negative, each upon the other. No measure can be carried, but by the joint consent of a majority of all the three. This ought to satisfy any republican, and any layman, who is at all reasonable.

It is the ministry only, and the succession of the ministry, that Churchmen suppose to be a divine and unchangeable part of Church Government. And this succession appears to them an exceedingly simple matter. A man who is the ambassador of a higher power than himself, must receive his commission to act, either mediately or immediately, from his superior; i. e. through this superior's own hands, or the hands of those who derived authority from him. Now to receive a commission immediately from God's own hands, would be miraculous, and must be proved by a miracle. To receive it otherwise, is to receive it through a line of persons authorized to transmit it; the *first* of whom received it from himself. And this is all the way now remaining, unless we allow miracles. But this is the famous "apostolic succession," i. e. succession from the apostles downward, which to many is such a mysterious or terrific conjuration.

NOTE 112, p. 294.

Cotton was accused of being instrumental in the banishment of Williams, and boldly denied the charge. But some of the magistrates solemnly testified, that they voted against Williams "by the advice and counsel of Mr. Cotton." Well, reader, and do you think he was cornered now? If so you are mistaken, for this was his reply, that "if he did counsel *one or two*, it would not argue the act of the magistrate." (Mass. H. Coll. 1st ser. viii. 4.) Oh no, certainly not; for the Jesuitical rule is, "We must not refuse absolution to those who live on the confines of sin." (Pascal's Prov. Letters, No. 5.)

And so when Rome counselled kings to put heretics to death, *she* was not guilty: "it would not argue the act of the magistrate." Who can fail to see the parallel in the deed, and in the apology; and who can

* We have also State or Diocesan conventions, for the immediate government of a State or Diocese, which are more democratic still; for in them the Bishop, Presbyters, and Laity, form but one body.

longer doubt that there have been Jesuits in the disguise of Puritans—Puritan-Papists as well as Puritan-Protestants? I should be deemed a monster, probably, if I said I thought Master Cotton one of these individuals; and so, duly afraid of an anathema, shall be cautious about rash assertions. But, really, it is quite impossible for me to say, how many such things as have now been recorded, how many such doublings as he showed about the case of Mrs. Hutchinson, and how many books like the "Bloody Tenet," would enable me to believe so thoroughly.

NOTE 113, p. 296.

Mr. Knowles, at the page quoted,* seems not to comprehend exactly Roger Williams's difficulty, which constrained him to withdraw from participation in the Eucharist, as administered by the Baptists. Fortunately, in Gammell's life of Williams, I find his own words, which enable me to understand what I was before in doubt of, viz., the precise cause of his withdrawment from visible communion. It was because he believed "the apostolical commission and ministry is long since interrupted and discontinued." (Gammell's R. Williams, p. 200.)

Now Williams was originally a Churchman, and would use such language as a Churchman might. To him, as a Churchman, the succession in the ministry was no novelty. As it was with Robinson, his church views and feelings revived in his later years. He could not find the apostolic succession about him, (no phenomenon to us!) and so he thought it gone, and that there could be no ministry but a miraculous one, viz., of inspired witnesses and prophets. It is no small consolation to think, that both Robinson and Williams came nearer to the Church of England, the nearer they came to their graves. The latter gave, what few would have the honesty to do, practical proof of a conviction that the "apostolic succession" is gone: he acknowledged no ministry and no ordinances whatever, *i. e.* none of those in his vicinity.

Because Williams was immersed by Holliman, Mr. Knowles gives us, singularly enough, a homily on the validity of lay-baptism! (Knowles's R. Williams, p. 166, etc.) Would that it were as easy for the Baptists to imitate him, in his thorough conviction of the necessity of an apostolic succession for the ministry.

NOTE 114, p. 298.

On more than one occasion, I have censured Mr. Bancroft for disingenuous changes from his first edition of his United States. I have now

* On pp. 171, 172, 173, he is clearer; but nothing he gives is so plain as the quotation by Gammell. He might have noticed that, for it is on his own pages. See p. 377.

to record a change, for which I must forgive him some of his sins; though I cannot free him from penance altogether.

In his first edition, i. 493, and in his seventh, i. 454, he sneers at Laud, to be sure; but he does go so venturously far, takes such a profound leap in condescension, as to allow his honesty. And, moreover, he does not flinch from this vast admission.

But in his first edition, i. 487, he makes a concession about the honesty of Puritan parsons, which, in his seventh, i. 449, he takes back!! The sentences are a curiosity for a Churchman, and I must quote them both. "But the people did not entirely respond to these extravagant views, into which personal interest, combined with honest bigotry, had betrayed the elders." Now for the change retrograde, in his view of Puritan honesty. "But the people did not entirely respond to these extravagant views, into which the bigotry of personal interest had betrayed the elders."

So the honesty of Laud continues, while that of Puritan parsons vanishes away! On the whole, the most severe penance I would inflict on Mr. B. would be, that henceforward he stick to his text.

NOTE 115, p. 340.

The term "idolaters" I would not be supposed to censure, though used even by a Puritan against a Papist. The Papist tells us, for the thousandth time, that he never *worships*, in the highest sense, any one but God. He *venerates* images, as we do our grandfathers' pictures, and *invokes* dead saints, just as we invoke living ones to pray for us, day after day. The excuse is familiar enough, and one would suppose that an *infallible* church might be consistent enough by this time. But behold such a prayer as this uttered by a devout dying Papist: "O Mary, mother of grace! mother of mercy! protect us from the enemy, and receive us at the hour of death!" (Rom. Cath. Mag., Feb. 1835, p. 65.)

But resources upon such a subject are endless. See Palmer's Letters to Wiseman, and Horne's Mariolatry: also Dr. Jarvis's irrefutable statements, in his "No Union with Rome." Mr. Palmer, for example, one of the most learned theologians, does not hesitate to declare to a Romish Bishop, "The Blessed Virgin is authoritatively set before your souls, instead of the Trinity." (Letters to Wiseman, p. 13, of L. i., Eng. ed.) Now the subject of worship to the Virgin, is about the most touchy, which you can handle with a Romanist. Depreciate *that*, and you are a heretic of the blackest dye. Yet here is a clergyman, of as high reputation as any in the Church of England, pledging his whole credit and learning to one of the most flagrant statements against Popery, which

(as Popery feels about it) human pen could write. And meanwhile he, and half his church, are Papists at heart! Faugh! argument is wasted upon mere abuse and prejudice; and I will say no more.

NOTE 116, p. 346.

I transcribe the passage alluded to, for fear, in this age of mutilated Bibles, many cannot find it.

"For the very historical truth is, that upon the importunate petitions of the Puritans, at his Majesty's coming to the crown, the conference at *Hampton Court* having been appointed for hearing their complaints, when by force of reason they were put from all other grounds, they had recourse at last to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the Communion Book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated; which was, as they said, a most corrupt translation. And although this was judged to be but a very poor and empty shift; yet even hereupon did his Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently after gave order for this translation which is now presented unto thee. Thus much to satisfy our scrupulous brethren."

This, and the whole Address of the Translators, though a part of the furniture of the original translation of the Bible, in 1611, is deliberately cut out by the largest society for publishing the English Bible in these United States; and yet Puritans marvel that Episcopalians are "scrupulous" about sanctioning its work, by uniting in it! Is not the scrupulosity rather on their side?

By the way, there seems to be much difficulty in finding a *cognomen* for Puritans, at the present day. I would call the attention of Editors to their ancient one, "our scrupulous brethren." Old Tom Fuller, however, who was somewhat of a Puritan himself, does not hesitate to call them "cripples in conformity." (Fuller, Ch. Hist. iii. 193. Or, v. 304, Edit. 1845.)

NOTE 117, p. 354.

It is unspeakably mortifying to a Protestant, to see the Puritans boasting so grandiloquently about a single translation of the Bible, prepared by one of *their* missionaries; when the Roman Catholics prepared for the use of the different tribes of Aborigines in Mexico, the enormous amount of twenty-four dictionaries and forty-five grammars! (See Thomas's Hist. of Printing, i. 193.)

I add to this note, what it is too late for me to notice in the text, that if any reader wishes for fuller information on the subject of the Quebec

Act, spoken of on p. 343, he may find it in a volume edited by J. Wright, from the notes of Sir Henry Cavendish, Bart., 8 vo., London, 1839.

NOTE 118, p, 367.

The number necessary for the foundation of a Congregational Church, i. e., the *pillars* on which its superstructure should be raised, is often stated as *seven*. But necessity requires that a genuine Congregationalist admit that *two* are sufficient.

Some of their writers have seen and owned this. The Catechism which Camfield examined in 1668 was very wary, and merely said that "an instituted church" was "a society of persons;" thus dodging the delicate difficulty about the number. (See Camfield's Exam., p. 100.) In the early days of Massachusetts, *seven* seems to have been the lowest canonical number; for Lechford says that Master Cotton censured the opinions of such as would lower this number to *two* or *three*. * (Sav. Wint. ii., 161. Bacon's Hist. Disc. pp. 20, 24. Mass. H. Coll. 3d ser. iii. 88, note. Trumbull's Hist. Connect. i. 284.)

Our modern theorists in congregrational polity feel the force of logic, and come fairly up to the mark;—with a qualm or two about necessity to be sure; but still they do in terms admit, that *two* may and can make a church. (See Congregational Catechism, 1844, p. 84.) This is less candid, however, than Punchard, who says *two* precisely, and tries to back himself with one of Tertullian's *inferences*, (not statements of fact,) which he picked up out of Dr. Campbell, and for which the Doctor was duly castigated in Skinner's Truth and Order, Am. Ed. pp. 127, 128. † This shows, by the way, how "our scrupulous brethren" treat the Fathers, when they can press them into service. Their *reasonings* and *opinions*, if they subserve their purposes, are good enough; whereas an intelligent Churchman treats the Fathers as he does other men, as to their reasonings and opinions, and defers to them only as testifiers to catholic or universal *matters of fact*, i. e., as to what the Church at large, in their day, believed and practised.

A want of discrimination on this point, in ignorant or prejudiced minds, has made such minds suppose that Churchmen swallowed down, without daring to question, *all* that the Fathers have said or written.—

* Baillie's Dissuasive, (pp. 107, 108,) says *seven* and *three*, were both recognized by the *English* Puritans. Compare Savage's Winthrop, i. 180.

† See Punchard's View of Congregationalism, Salem, 1840, p. 117; and for another reference about the perverted passage from Tertullian, see Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, Chap. iv. or pp. 226, 227, 1st edit. or p. 217, 2d edit. Tertullian broached the opinion that two might make a church, after he himself had left the Church. No wonder. Any heretic would do so, to comfort himself.

Why will men be so perverse? Is it not easy enough to make a distinction between an *author* and a *testifier?* between a man advocating his own private opinions, and the same man telling us, as a witness, what were the belief and the practice of those around him? A Churchman thinks so; and therefore while he rejects Tertullian's, or any other uninspired man's logic, he receives Tertullian's record of catholic facts, as very important. Now as to several of his *opinions,* Tertullian was no doubt somewhat Puritanical, and the Church Catholic classed him accordingly with the heretics.* As to his *facts,* he most clearly represents the Church Catholic, in his day, as Episcopal. But all a Congregationalist wants is his *opinions.* That is, he can pin his faith upon the *opinion* of a solitary individual, and let go that Church's wide-consenting *testimony,* against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. And this is the way, by the exercise of private judgment, to escape error, when error, like contagion, fills the air we breathe, and one careless day amid its noxious fumes may poison us to death!

I must add one thing more to this note, though long already. From the Congregational theory of a church, it follows, that the union or voluntary compact of two or more, under a Christian name, constitutes them church-members, and not baptism into the name of the Holy Trinity. Accordingly we find the Connecticut Hooker (the rival of Cotton, who had to leave Massachusetts to give Cotton full scope) lays down with due formality, that Baptism cannot make us members of the Church. (Summe, Pt. i. chaps. 4 and 5. Also Apology for Church Covenant of N. Eng. Churches, 1643, p. 5. Comp. Antapologia, p. 48.)

Thus we see, that Congregationalism, in its wilfulness, strikes at any thing. Our Lord told his apostles to make disciples of all nations, (and, by the way, not of all the adults of all nations†—he put no such anabaptist comment on his meaning,) *all* nations, baptizing them, &c. An apostle afterwards said, that as many as (*οσοι*—whoever—those who—again, not adults merely,) have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. (Gal. iii. 27.)

But no, says the Congregationalist, making a covenant together constitutes men Christ's disciples, and by this covenant do they put Christ on.‡

* A pretty fair proof that Puritanism was then, as afterwards, one of "the novelties which disturb our peace."

† Does a nation consist of adults only, or of men, women and children of all ages? And besides, if it is wrong to baptize children, then the command *to teach* does not relate to them, and Baptists should eschew all Sunday Schools, &c.

‡ To meet some of the difficulties on this subject, Mr. Stone, of Hartford, Ct., published, in 1652, his tract, to show that "a Congregational church" is "a catholic

NOTE 119, p. 371.

Punchard, in his view of Congregationalism, admits in form the validity of lay-ordination. (See p. 124.) The ordaining councils of old time were obliged to admit it, however unwelcome: the people chose to have it so, and doubtless the people did but act out Congregational theory to the full. (See Trumbull's Connect. i. 286. And comp. Bacon's Hist. Disc. p. 294.) And to show what strange language can be used, even by a minister, and at an ordination, I quote, as a specimen, from a charge delivered by Dr. Frothingham, at the ordination of Mr. Lunt in New York, 1828. "When the minister of this new church was invited to assume that trust, and consented to assume it, he became, by those acts, a minister of the gospel among this people. We have not come here to make him such. He was so before we came. We confer no new privilege on *him*. We bestow no new gift on *them*. We lay no new obligations on either. The covenant is between themselves."

NOTE 120, p. 371.

The lengths to which their theory of development led, and must lead the Puritans, they were duly advised of. For example, Edwards asked them, "whether a great gap and wide door be not left open for schism upon schism, and separation upon separation, from your churches to the Brownists, [he says thus, for at this time they had begun to draw off from the Brownists, as less respectable,] and from the Brownists to the Anabaptists, and so on *in infinitum*?" (Antapologia, p. 200.)

And such language had a curious illustration. The question came up, practically, in Mr. Lathrop's society, whether the baptisms of the Church of England were valid? The decision was (*Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis amici?*) that "at present," they would not say they were invalid! and even that decision rent in twain the congregation which made it! (Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d series, i. 167, 168.) Afterwards, Mr. Bartlet, who was minister of the "Congregational Way" at Wapping, in 1646, and published his "Modell" in 1647, claimed some credit for himself because, in opposition to many, he *did* believe in the validity of the baptisms of the Church of England; and, forsooth, on the old ground of lay-baptism, that right matter and words are all which are necessary to any baptism, and the administrator is—any body. (Bartlet's Cong. Way, pp. 104, 105.) It must be a precious consolation to Churchmen to think that their baptisms are valid, because they are lay-baptisms! However,

visible church." I have not space to quote it; but one thing the reader can perceive, that these old Puritans had none of that puerile horror of the word "catholic," which we sometimes see now.

Robinson, the putative father of Congregationalism, never got far enough, be it remembered, to allow them so much as this! All his condescension reached participation with the Church of England in prayers and sermons only; from her sacraments he held off to the last. And now, verily, his posterity think it a horrible thing in Episcopalians, that they do not recognize *his* sacraments, begun and perpetuated in manifest schism; and that, too, simply because we think them in error about the polity Christ has set in his Church, and not because we charge them, as Robinson did the Church of England, with having sacraments* positively corrupt and anti-Christian. We doubt their *heads:* Robinson and his followers denounced our Church's very *heart.* Can it be surprising that it is the fashion of his followers to doubt of nothing sooner than of the piety of an Episcopalian—to assume nothing with more ease, than to sit in judgment on his soul and attack his motives, as if they were discerners of the thoughts and intents of the heart—to come to no conclusion with more speed or satisfaction, than that he (most especially if unfortunate enough to be called a high-churchman) is to be cast out of the pale of charity, and to be withstood as deserving of nothing but the buffetings of Satan?

NOTE 121, p. 372.

Justice Story expresses this in captivating language: "Their precept, like their example, speaking as it were from their sepulchres, is, to follow truth now, not as they saw it, but as we see it, fearlessly and faithfully." (Story's Misc., p. 61.) I wish I could give such apparently philanthropic counsel a good paternity; but I am afraid I must trace it to some of the worst of those puritanically inclined, about the period of the Reformation. One of the peculiarities of the German sectaries, according to Dugdale, was, that *that* was not Divine truth which lay upon the pages of the Bible, but which those pages helped our own minds to see. In other words, the very Bible itself must be distilled through the alembic of our understandings, before its specific truths could appear. Its written declarations were nothing. Dugdale, in his "Short View," thus describes the matter. "The truth, said they, was, (that when the word is said to engender faith in the heart, and to convert the soul of man, or to work any such spiritual divine effect,) these speeches are not thereunto appliable, as it is read and preached, but as it is engrafted in us by the power of the Holy Ghost." (Dugdale, p. 3.) And what seems not a little curious, Ap.

* Marriages too. Edwards charges one of the very writers of the "Apologeticall Narration," with going over to Holland to be married by a magistrate, because Robinson's system required it. So the Puritans would have bastardized England!! —Antapologia, p. 22.

Laud noticed a similar thing in the Puritans of his day; and said that this was one particular, among others, wherein they resembled the Papists. (Conference with Fisher, new edit. p. 81.)

Unquestionably with the Puritans that only was truth which appeared to be truth to them; and there was no such thing whatever as objective truth, or truth in the abstract. And one fruit of this appeared in the "Apologeticall Narration," which fell like a bomb into the midst of the Westminster Assembly. Another shape of it was a refusal to have the Bible read in the congregation, unless expounded; for read, merely, it was not the Bible.* And finally, Fox and the Quakers carried this to perfection, by making every thing dependent on the light within.

NOTE 122, p. 378.

One proof of this is the necessity of some publications of the day, to try to reconcile them. I have before me, *e. g.* an octavo pamphlet of nearly 100 pages, published in 1648, the benevolent aim of which was, "The reconcilement of that long debated and much lamented difference, between the godly Presbyterians and the godly Independents, about Church Government." But for all their godliness, these Presbyterians and Independents fought on, and fought it out, to the bitter end.

I am willing, however, to close this note with the testimony of a Presbyterian contemporary. He solemnly declares, that the Presbyterians were content for an accommodation "in just terms;" but, he adds, "the Independents always scorned it." (Baillie's Letters, &c., ii. 179.) It is not very hard to believe this; for Puritan-Protestants, just like their counterparts, Puritan-Papists,† have always found it one of the hardest of tasks to agree to disagree, *i. e.* to entertain mutual tolerance for an opponent. No, says the Puritan; No, says the Inquisitor; I can make such an agreement with nobody. You must come up to my standard in every thing; or—or—*I'll make you.*

NOTE 123, p. 381.

There was another sufferer put to death with Mr. Love, whom I presume was a Presbyterian, but I can find no particular account of him. His name was Gibbons; and from an allusion to him on p. iv, of the preface to Love's sermons, republished in 1807, I should suppose him to have been a Presbyterian minister. If so, then we have *three* Presbyterian martyrs instead of two.

* Maddox's Vindication, p. 185.

† This term was by no means singular among our old divines. I have referred in Note 36, to some instances: I now give another.—Proceedings at Perth, London, 1621, Pt. iii. p. 87.

NOTE 124, p. 399. (Second line of the foot notes.)

The Hon. R. C. Winthrop, in his Address before the New England Society in 1839, cannot forbear giving Virginia a severe side-cut for her slave-trade.* (See p. 52.) Surely the recollection of Indians *sold* and negroes *bought* into slavery, by the Puritan Colony of Massachusetts, and that as early as 1637, (Felt's Salem, p. 109,) when she was at the height of her Puritan glory, and had done nothing towards her great chartered duty of converting the savages, ought to make even as earnest advocates of herself as we know the Bay State habitually supplies, somewhat cautious about castigation of a sister government. More especially, when we know that this poor denounced Virginia commenced her system with universal suffrage, while Massachusetts, with a temper worthy the age of Hildebrand himself, would tolerate no one as a freeman who would not profess and maintain Puritanism in its whole length and breadth. And again, too, when we know that the Colony of Virginia remonstrated against the slave-trade with the Mother-Country, and besought her to arrest it: to the shame of Britain be it spoken, wholly in vain! (See Walsh's Appeal, Sect. ix. or p. 317.)†

In this step, I am informed that Virginia was not alone—that South Carolina *e. g.* did the same thing, and with like success. Walsh declares, that Virginia's efforts in this matter began as far back as 1662—when, perhaps, I add, New England was doing, what she certainly did afterwards, import slaves into our southern states, and sell them there! God forbid that I should be, or seem to be, an advocate for slavery, which I account an awful curse. But when I see northerners abusing southerners for its existence among them, I blush for shame; for I am sadly aware that if *our* vessels had not imported and sold slaves into southern states,* there would have been many, very many fewer slaves there, and by this time, possibly, they might have given *all* their freedom. Now, for the burden thrown upon them by northern hands, they must wait a tedious time. But of all who should be the last to complain, and who should have longest patience with them, are New Englanders and their descendants.

* Massachusetts was ready enough to catch Virginia's runaway slaves in old times, whatever she may do now.—See Gov. Berkley's Letter. Hutchinson's Coll. pp. 136, 137.

† Can any such bold remonstrance be found among the annals of Massachusetts? Belknap, who says all he can, speaks of none.—Mass. H. Coll. 1st ser. iv. 195,6.

‡ Mass. H. Coll. 1st ser. iv. 197, admits this; and on the next page it is shown, with what a true Puritan conscience, some of the New Englanders treated the subject of slavery. They declaimed against the slave-trade with all their might; yet, when slaves were brought to their doors, actually bought them and *justified* their possession of them. Abraham, &c., they said, had slaves, and so might they have. Here we have *doctrine*, and there *practice!*

NOTE 125, p. 399.

"One professed design," says Hutchinson, "of the colony charter, was the gospelizing the natives. *The long neglect of any attempts this way cannot be excused.* The Indians themselves asked, how it happened, if Christianity was of such importance, that for six and twenty years together the English had said nothing to them about it." (Hutch. Hist. i. 150.) This brings in "the Plymouthians" also guilty; for this six and twenty years runs back to 1620, the date of *their* settlement.

The whole then goes to show, that stupid as the Indians were, inaccessible by Christian ideas according to Puritan doctrine, they had wit enough to see into and condemn a most flagrant Puritan inconsistency. No marvel then that the Puritans thought them (as the Presbyterian Mr. Stone tells us) the agents and familiars of the Devil, and therefore fit for nothing but destruction. (See Stone's Brant, Pref. p. xv.)

NOTE 126, p. 408. (Sixth line of the foot notes.)

I am quite willing to suppose that Gov. Winslow stated what he believed, (or, rather, to follow his own language,) *thought* to be true. Yet, if the Indians were always compensated for every foot of their territory, how comes it that Seipican, or Rochester, in Massachusetts, is given away by Plymouth in 1638, while in 1682, *after the sale* of Rochester, a native sets up a claim to it, proves it, and has his claim allowed? (See Mass. Hist. Coll. 2d ser. iv. 258, 265.) And further, take Gov. Winslow's testimony at the utmost: he says, with unlucky emphasis, "*this* colony;" implying that the sister colony did otherwise. So his testimony condemns Massachusetts, at all events. Moreover, it is equivocal in any sense. It says "I think," and not "I am sure." It says lands were always bought "before these present troubles." But when did they begin? There's the rub. Some would say, Almost as soon as Puritan feet ouched Indian soil. So Mr. Young may make the most of his friend Winslow's testimony, in welcome. He must pardon me for weighing Puritan language with precision: *experientia docet.*

NOTE 127, p. 411.

No sooner, however, do we get through the purchase of Concord, than we find the General Court giving away plantations "adjoining Concord," as Shattuck says, with entire freedom, as if the rest of the country were theirs exclusively.* How could this be lawfully done? (Shattuck's

* Even such grants could be refused to those who favored a heretic like Roger Williams.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. viii. 2.

Concord, pp. 13, 14.) There does not appear any evidence to show, that *these new grantees* paid or offered to pay for the soil; and indeed Shattuck is obliged to admit that the grantees of Concord itself were not in any hurry to purchase or pay for their land, (p. 6.)—in any more hurry, *e. g.* than the General Court was to pay for its gunpowder. (Sav. Wint. ii. 211.) Doubtless, however, they paid in time to prevent such a quarrel as happened in 1631 about Indian purchases; and the recollection of which might have quickened action in 1636. (See Mather's Ind. Tbls., p. 23, for the dispute.)

Perhaps I ought to add, that Shattuck's theory is, that the General Court granted a mere permission to settle. (P. 4.) But their *action* reads very differently. They granted not a mere permission to settle, but a precise number of acres, *e. g.*, as on p. 14, such a curiously specific number as 533.* The proper way would have been to begin at the other end—ask permission of the natives, buy their property, and then go to the Legislature to confirm the bargain. It is a curious way to purchase a man's property, to squat upon it, as we now say, and then compel him to sell it—*if we like it.*

Finally, purchasing in *one* case condemns the Puritans for not purchasing in every other. A solitary purchase was a tacit, yet complete recognition of Indian title to the soil; and folios of such logic as Higginson's and Bulkley's could not mend the matter afterwards. (For Higginson's, see Hutch. Coll. p. 30. For Bulkley's, see Mass. Hist. Coll. 1st ser. iv. 159.)

NOTE 128, p. 414.

An authority from Benedict's Baptists speaks volumes upon this subject. It shows how Massachusetts and Connecticut conspired to put Rhode Island down, on account of the religious freedom indulged there; and when they could not accomplish their aims otherwise, employed the Indian tomahawk and scalping knife to endeavor to drive them through. "Connecticut and Massachusetts, on either side of them, were now making strong exertions to enforce their religious laws, and could not endure the maxims of this little colony, which were a tacit and standing condemnation of *their* bigotry and intolerance. They therefore stretched their lines, if possible, to swallow up the little State, and Massachusetts actually took possession of a large share of it on one side, and Connecticut on

* Compare Felt's Ipswich, pp. 14, 15.—Nay, the poor Indians themselves had to apply to the Legislature just like any other newcomers!—Allen's Chelmsford, pp. 8, 9. This proves incontestably that the Legislature looked upon itself, as the sole proprietor of the soil.

the other; but failing of their design on this plan, they encouraged the Indians to harass them to the loss of 80 or 100 pounds a year; they refused to let them have ammunition for their money, when in imminent danger; they fomented divisions among them, and encouraged their subjects to refuse obedience to their authority; they finally labored hard, after they could not dismember the colony, to gain a party within its bounds of sufficient strength to outvote them in their elections, and establish among them their abominable system of parish worship and parish taxes." (Benedict, i. 466.)

So, then, the Puritans could use the Indians against *others* without scruple; but when an Indian weapon was turned against *themselves*, they could, as the poor Pequots found out, exterminate a nation. Had the Pequots dismembered Rhode Island, they might have founded a kingdom upon its ruins, till—till—the Puritans wanted it for themselves. For though Indians could be used against those not Puritans, to subjugate them to the faith; when that was done, they must bow down in turn, or follow the same destiny. Roger Williams says that when he was going to England, he was importuned by the Narragansett sachems to appeal in their behalf "to the high sachems of England, that they might not be forced from their religion, and for not changing their religion be invaded by war; for they said they were daily visited with threatenings by Indians that came from about the Massachusetts, that if they would not pray, they should be destroyed by war." (R. I. Hist. Coll. iii. 154.) So Puritanism understood how to dragoon heretics into the faith, or seize upon their possessions, as well as the papistical Louis XIV.

NOTE 129, p. 418.

It is irresistibly amusing to see how the Puritans copied England in bad things, though all the while bitterly blaming her. They ventured a revolution, because taxed without their own consent; but in Note 91, it will be seen they adopted such a principle as quite right for *them*. They thought it vast indignity for the English to call us *rebels*. But so sure as an Indian, after being wheedled into an act of which he knew nothing of the import, i. e. a *pro forma* declaration of allegiance to the British Crown,)* dared to act contrary to loyalty, *he* was a *rebel* of most malignant heinousness, and if he escaped with life and servile bondage might think himself full fortunate. (Mass. H. Coll. 1st ser. iv. 196.)

* Here is a specimen. A Puritan governor tells a sachem, that the King is his friend and ally. The Indian replies to the compliment, that he was the King's subject. Alas, poor Red Man! that had to go down in black and white.—Hutchinson's Hist. i. 252.

And, now, for the result of such severity. Some of these Indians escaped from servile bondage, returned, and helped to provoke wars and glut their revenge. (Same vol. and page.) But then I suppose we must believe, with Dr. Bacon, that such a war, on the part of the Puritans, as in the case of the hapless Pequots, is "a war as righteous as ever was waged." (Bacon's Hist. Disc. p. 330.) Had not Puritan advocates better be more chary of the reputation of the days of '76? if a war against *rebels* is as righteous as any, monarchical tories will make them a low bow for such exquisite orthodoxy.*

NOTE 130, p. 420.

Dr. Holmes, in his Annals, seems vexed with the Hon. Mr. Savage, for censuring so freely the execution of Miantonimoh. He calls his language the pleading of a mere *advocate*, and refers to Judge Davis's, as that of a *judge*. (Annals, i. 272.) Indeed, good Doctor, and in your own is there nothing of the Puritan *parson?* for you forget, entirely, to mention the instrumentality of the *Elders* in the awful matter.

But take it, even with Dr. H.'s favorite reference, the reader cannot but be shocked, to see a professed minister of the Gospel sanctioning a dastardly assassination. "If," says Judge Davis, (and there is vast emphasis in the *if* of the learned jurist—he would not have left the thing so open could he have helped it,) "If sad necessity required the sacrifice, there seems a revolting obliquity in the manner of its accomplishment." (Davis's Morton, p. 234, Note.) How could Judge D. call it less than shocking, when, like the familiars of the Inquisition, they kept their horrid purpose "a profound secret?" (Trumbull's Connect. i. 134.)

It cannot be astonishing that Puritan parsons should countenance the most *shocking obliquities* in 1643, if one of their successors can coolly defend such obliquities in 1829.

NOTE 131, p. 425. (Last line of the foot notes.)

Dr. Trumbull's language does not want strength, and yet says Dr. Dwight, as if any thing like it must be utter slander, "The annals of the world cannot furnish a single instance, in which a nation, or any other

* Rebellion against a Puritan theocracy is treason against God as well as man, as we have seen. But only let the Puritans get into power, and even such a violent writer as Dr. Mayhew says, "government is *sacred*, and not to be *trifled* with."—See his furious philippic preached against King Charles I.'s day, which was thought worthy of introduction into the "Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy Shaken," of the notorious Richard Baron—a man who abandoned even the Puritanic ministry in disgust. For the quoted words, see Pillars, &c., vol. ii. 336.

body politic, has treated its allies or its subjects either with more justice or more humanity, than the New England Colonists treated these people," *i. e.* the Aborigines. (Dwight's Travels, i. 167.) More justice or more humanity! why, (not to repeat the terrible testimony already given,) as Winthrop admits, the English, aye the Puritan English, could put a poor prisoner, taken by his fellow-savages, to the torture: thus imitating their most fiend-like practice; and, too, on the express plea of revenge for similar deeds! (Sav. Wint. i. 223.) Their soldiers, taught under the auspices of Puritan chaplains, could talk of shooting an Indian as sportively as of shooting "a black duck." (Hutchinson's Hist. ii. p. 267.) Puritan parsons at home could say to the soldiers, to make them fiercer, (as Monks have said to Papists about to battle with heretics,) that the "Indians should be bread for them." (Mather's Troubles, p. 42.) And all this doubtless, because, as an honest Presbyterian tells us, the Indians were believed to be the agents and familiars of the prince of darkness. (Stone's Brant. Pref. p. xv.) *

And still are we to be told, that more justice or more humanity cannot be found in "the annals of the world," than are to be found in the annals of Puritan treatment of the Aborigines! Oh, if so, then all I have to say is, that divines of Dr. Dwight's school need not trouble themselves to preach of a future place of woe: if this whole world, in all its history, cannot produce aught more of comfort than the Aborigines experienced at Puritan hands, it is sufficiently a Pandemonium already, to render a sadder place unnecessary.

NOTE 132, p. 427.

In allusion to the sentiment at the close, perhaps I cannot do better than quote Richard Baxter's most pertinent rebuke to the Puritans, for their harsh and wholesale way of condemning Churchmen in the gross, and upon mere suspicion, in the exercise of their all-discerning and infallible private judgment. The passage, too, is a fair and incidental illustration of a Churchman's way of judging, *i. e.* upon evidence.

"You never *try* them, nor *hear* them speak for themselves, nor examine any witnesses publicly against them, nor allow them any church-justice; but avoid their communion, [another proof, by the way, that they disowned the sacraments of Episcopalians,] upon reports or pretence of private knowledge. They judge you *personally, one by one.* You condemn *whole parishes* in the *lump, unheard.* They condemn you as for a

* "Dogs, caitiffs, miscreants, and hell-hounds," says Belknap, "are the politest names given them by some writers." He alludes to such as Hubbard and Mather; whose terrific animosity against the Indians he cannot put up with, for all their Puritanism.—Belknap's N. Hamp. i. 67.

positive crime. But you condemn them without charging any one crime upon them, because they have not yet given you a satisfying proof of their godliness." (Baxter's Cure of Church Divisions, 2d edit. 1670. p. 255. And with Baxter's own italics.)

When I read in Clement Walker, that one of the six principles of the Puritan-Independents* was, "That if a man be questioned for any crime, though his judges have neither competent witnesses, proofs, nor evidence of his guiltiness, yet if they think in their conscience he is guilty, they may condemn him out of the testimony of their own private conscience"—when, I say, I read this, I thought Mr. Walker, though esteemed highly by his Presbyterian brethren, might have strained a point a little. But as Baxter, whose name is almost a Puritan watchword, sustains him, I must suppose his judgment correct.

And after all, what does Baxter censure, and what Walker, save but what we now see, only in a form less dangerous according to the circumstances of our times, viz., the hasty and sweeping judgment of Puritans upon the piety, *i. e.* the *secret state* of the souls of those who differ from them: a judgment founded, not upon facts, but upon their own bare suspicions.† And how common this is, all of moderate acquaintance with them must know. *They* are the people: *they* only understand and exemplify the religion of the heart. Papists and Churchmen, on the one side, are believers in mere forms; while Socinians and Universalists, on the other, are believers in false doctrines. *They* only are right in the sight of God; and for any one who dares to differ from *them*, there is a shake of the head, and an uprolling of the eye, or a shrug, or an alas! and your piety, oh, it becomes, like the bishops with Milton, the basest and the lowermost of all things.

And to wind up this description, how like to the Papist, though he never suspects it, is the Puritan in this very thing! The Papist denounces you for a heretic, without a qualm and without a pause, because he is infallible. The Puritan denounces you as destitute of piety, with as little compunction and as little hesitancy, because he, too, is no more liable to error. Both judgments are the most awful which can be pronounced upon a fellow-creature; and yet the Papist on one side of us, and the Puritan on the other, will show us that they can be pronounced with a fearlessness, which Gabriel the archangel—the highest perhaps of created names—would recoil from with a shudder.

* Walker's Independency, Pt. iii. p. 23.

† See this *practically* admitted by Milton; who undertakes to prove, that Bishop Juxon and Charles I. were hypocrites, not by facts, but "by arguments;" *i. e.* by arguing facts into a shape to suit himself.—Prose Works, p. 939.

ERRATA.

In a work so difficult to print, in consequence of the numerous references, dates, and quotations, it is hoped the reader will excuse the following errata—and others, should he discover them.

Page 66, 2d line of the foot notes, for 1663 read 1633.
" 82, 8th line from bottom of text, for " finally" read " formally."
" 86, 9th line from top, for " whome" read " whom."
" 202, 18th line from top, the word " for" omitted.
" 274, 10th line of the foot notes, for " Wells" read " Weld."
" 348, 4th line of the foot notes, for " More's" read " Moore's."
" 389, 1st line of foot notes, for 231 read 331.
" 396, bottom line, for " and" read " of."

onto

ket

MITED

BINDING DEPT. DEC 27 1962

HEcclUS.
C.
200042

Author Coit, Thomas W.

Title Puritanism.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 12 02 03 07 014 0